DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 475 AA 000 779

AUTHOR	Falcon, James C.
TITLE	What State Legislators Think about School Finance. An Opinion Survey of State Legislature Education Committee Chairman.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.; President's Commission on School Finance, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	3 Jan 72
NOTE	162p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Finance; Educational Innovation; Education Vouchers; *Federal Aid; *Governance; Performance Contracts; Private Schools; Program Administration; *School Taxes; *State Aid; Statistical Studies; Tax Allocation

ABSTRACT

The attitudes of State legislative education committee chairmen concerning possible changes in the financing and governance of education were surveyed. The chairmen provided comments on the deficiencies in federal, State, and local revenue sources; discussed problems of governance; gave their opinions on educational innovations and program management; and expressed their attitudes toward nonpublic schools. The report presents statistical data on the responses to individual questions in the survey, and concludes that the committee chairmen favor substantial changes in elementary and secondary school finance. They support (1) increased State financing of education to equalize tax burdens among localities, (2) greater reliance on income taxation with consequent local property ta relief, (3) reformation of local property tax assessment procedures, (4) increased federal assistance in the form of general aid to education, and (5) increased spending on education research and development. Most chairmen react unfavorably to public aid to nonpublic schools. (For related document, see ED 058 473.) (Author/JF)

ED 058 410

WHAT STATE LEGISLATORS THINK ABOUT SCHOOL FINANCE

An Opinion Survey of State Legislature Education Committee Chairmen

Survey by
Educational Testing Service

Report by
Commission Staff

Submitted to The President's Commission on School Finance

AA 000 777

THIS IS ONE OF SEVERAL REPORTS PREPARED FOR THIS COMMISSION. TO AID IN OUR DELIBERATIONS, WE HAVE SOUGHT THE BEST QUALIFIED PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS TO CONDUCT THE MANY STUDY PROJECTS RELATING TO OUR BROAD MANDATE. COMMISSION STAFF MEMBERS HAVE ALSO PREPARED CERTAIN REPORTS.

WE ARE PUBLISHING THEM ALL SO THAT OTHERS MAY HAVE ACCESS TO THE SAME COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF THESE SUBJECTS THAT THE COMMISSION SOUGHT TO OBTAIN. IN OUR OWN FINAL REPORT WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO ADDRESS IN DETAIL EVERY ASPECT OF EACH AREA STUDIED. BUT THOSE WHO SEEK ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS INTO THE COMPLEX PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION IN GENERAL AND SCHOOL FINANCE IN PARTICULAR WILL FIND MUCH CONTAINED IN THESE PROJECT REPORTS.

WE HAVE FOUND MUCH OF VALUE IN THEM FOR OUR OWN DELIBERATIONS. THE FACT THAT WE ARE NOW PUBLISHING THEM, HOWEVER, SHOULD IN NO SENSE BE VIEWED AS ENDORSEMENT OF ANY OR ALL OF THEIR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED THIS REPORT AND THE OTHERS BUT HAS DRAWN ITS OWN CONCLUSIONS AND WILL OFFER ITS OWN RECOMMENDATIONS. THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION MAY WELL BE AT VARIANCE WITH OR IN OPPOSITION TO VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS AND OTHER PROJECT REPORTS.

The President's Commission
on School Finance

Neil H. McElroy, Chairman
Mary T. Brooks
William G. Colman
Hilda A. Davis
John B. Davis, Jr.
John H. Fischer
Dorothy M. Ford
Norman Francis
Eugene Gonzales
Warren P. Knowles
David H. Kurtzman
Duane Mattheis
William E. McManus
Wendell H. Pierce
William G. Saltonstall
W. B. Thompson
Clarence Walton
Ivan E. Zylstra

Norman Karsh, Executive Director

WHAT STATE LEGISLATORS THINK ABOUT SCHOOL FINANCE

An Opinion Survey of State Legislature Education Committee Chairmen

Survey Conducted by:

Educational Testing Service
F. Reid Creech, Project Director

Report Prepared by:

James C. Falcon
President's Commission on School Finance

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE.. 1

SURVEY PROCEDURE... 3

REVENUE SOURCES.. 5

DISTRIBUTION OF STATE FUNDS...................................... 12

GOVERNANCE... 14

EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.......... 19

ATTITUDES TOWARDS NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS.................... 25

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS............................ 27

STATISTICAL DATA:

REVENUE SOURCES.. 31

DISTRIBUTION OF STATE FUNDS.............................. 51

GOVERNANCE... 55

EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT..... 73

ATTITUDES TOWARDS NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS................ 94

APPENDICES:

A. PROJECT TIME SCHEDULE.............................. 100

B. LIST OF RESPONDENTS................................ 102

C. INTERVIEW GUIDE.................................... 117

D. LIST OF SPECIAL TABULATIONS....................... 155

PREFACE

Between the middle of July and the end of September, 1971, the chairmen of the education committees in State legislatures were interviewed on behalf of the President's Commission on School Finance in order to determine the attitudes of this influential and knowledgeable population towards problems and possible changes in the finance and governance of elementary and secondary schools.

The interviewing was conducted by highly experienced interviewers in the employ of Educational Testing Service, under contract to the Commission. It followed an interview guide, developed initially by the Commission's staff and refined with the advice of ETS, who provided technical and professional assistance in all aspects of the survey. The interview guide was tested in late June through trial interviews with four legislative appropriations committee chairmen.

Respondents were interviewed separately by ETS interviewers, at a place convenient to the respondent, according to appointments arranged by the Commission staff.

The cooperation and assistance of the education committee chairmen were outstanding. The interviews required from one and one-half to two hours of intensive discussion, often at times when legislatures were still in session grappling with many other persistent problems. The Commission staff is most grateful to them for their willing and timely participation.

From the viewpoint of Commission staff, relations with Educational Testing Service were excellent and its assistance absolutely essential. F. Reid Creech led the ETS team on this project. He contributed greatly to the development of the interview guide and analysis of the data and he was an enjoyable co-worker throughout the project. The content of the final report, however, is the responsibility of the writer. It is sincerely hoped that the State education committee chairmen's views have been presented fairly and accurately in this report.

James C. Falcon
Research Associate
President's Commission on
School Finance
January 3, 1972

SURVEY PROCEDURE

Timing. This project was initiated on April 27, 1971 and the tabulation of survey results was delivered by the contractor on October 1. The field work for this study was conducted during the period July 18 to September 21, 1971. A complete time schedule of important dates during the project is contained in Appendix A to this report.

The Population. The respondents in this survey were the chairmen of State legislature committees with responsibility for education matters. Because of diversity among the States in matters of school district organization, local taxing powers and restrictions thereon, and aid distribution formulae, the drawing of a representative sample of States was not attempted, and all 50 States were included in the population. Given Nebraska's unicameral legislature, there was a maximum of 99 respondents. Within the time available, 97 interviews were completed. Five vacancies in committee chairmanships were discovered and substitutes were selected by the Commission's Project Monitor, generally on the advice of the clerk of the legislative house involved. They were committee vice chairmen, ranking majority members, or ranking members of joint interim committees on education, depending upon the structure and practices of the particular State involved. The chairmen who were interviewed are listed in Appendix B.

The Commission, through ETS, guaranteed to respondents the anonymity of their specific answers.

The Interview Guide. Questions included in the interview guide were developed initially by the Commission's staff, re-worked into more appropriate form by ETS' item specialists, evaluated in test interviews with four legislative appropriations committee chairmen, and finally revised following suggestions made by the interviewing staff during a scheduled training session.

The content of survey questions was selected by Commission staff on the basis of the questions posed by the President in the Executive order establishing the Commission and also took into account the issues specified in the Commission's plan for implementing the Executive order.

The interview guide, as used in the field and including instructions to interviewers, is published as Appendix C.

Tabulation and Analysis of Results. The results of the interviews were tabulated by ETS according to specifications developed by the joint project team. In addition to a "straight" tabulation of questions and answers in frequency and percentage, a number of cross-tabulations were made, comparing the responses on one question with responses to other related questions. The results were also tabulated in 44 subsets, which divided the population along various lines, e.g.: respondents representing rural areas; respondents from States with high degrees of State financial support; respondents who took specified positions on certain key questions; etc. The subsets are listed in Appendix D, and they were used to improve analysis and round out our perception of respondents' views.

These tabulations and cross-tabulations of results were the basis for the narrative analyses presented under the major topical headings in this report. A straight tabulation of results, with some limited cross-tabbing, is presented under the "Statistical Data" section of this report.

REVENUE SOURCES

The education committee chairmen see the need for several changes in the financing of the schools. They identify deficiencies at all levels of government--State, local and Federal.

State Revenues

While State revenues are generally not earmarked for education, the State taxes that benefit education the most are general sales taxes, personal income tax, tax on real property or the transfer thereof, and excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco products. No other State revenue source was reported as being of substantial importance to education finance. The personal income tax is not a major source of revenue, according to 25 respondents, but 16 of them believe that it should be added to their State's revenue program. One-third of all respondents (34%) believe that income tax rates should be increased and an equal number (33%) believe that no change is needed. Rate decreases are advocated by only 5%. (Statistical data on pp. 31, 32)

Respondents from States having State-wide property taxes favor either no change or a decrease in rate. This is consistent with attitudes displayed throughout the survey towards property taxation.

Respondents from States having sales and excise taxes as major sources are most favorably inclined toward maintaining existing rates. (p. 32)

On the basis of present programs and levels of State support of the schools, only 28% of the respondents felt that their State's revenue yield was adequate for today. The contrast between predominantly rural and predominantly urban States, however, is significant.

Seventy-eight percent of the respondents from the predominantly urban States felt revenue sources to be inadequate while only 50% of responses from more rural States indicated revenues to be inadequate.

In regard to future revenue needs, national responses indicate that 25% of all chairmen felt that their State's revenue would be adequate. (Data on p. 33)

Over half of the respondents, representing 30 States, report legislative measures currently in the works which would change some aspect of the way those States raise or distribute money to support schools. This activity is more prevalent in the more heavily urbanized States than in rural States. (p. 34)

Local Revenues

Although education is, by definition in State constitutions, a State function, the financing of the schools has historically been delegated to the local school districts. In the 1970-71 school year, local finances accounted for approximately 56% of the total State and local revenues for public elementary and secondary schools nationally. In New Hampshire, 90% of school funds came from localities.

The local revenues devoted to the finance of the schools are closest to the people, from the viewpoint of controllability by the electorate. Given their crucial role in school finance, attitudes about them could well be expected to affect constituents', and legislators', views on school finance, and probably result in some "spillover" of attitudes about other aspects of the schools' programs as well. Indeed, there is a large body of well-regarded evidence that such is the case--that dissatisfaction with local taxation may in part be a cause of some dissatisfactions with the schools' performance.

Property taxation is nearly universal as a source of local revenue for the schools. In most States, it is the only local revenue source. Local non-property tax revenues are directly available to local school districts in only a few States. In ten States, local sales taxes help support the schools, and local taxes on personal income and business income are available in 4 and 5 States, respectively. Local sales taxation is more prevalent in the predominantly-rural States and the local income taxes are utilized more heavily by the predominantly-urban States. Local excises (on liquor, tobacco, and automobiles) and licenses also help support local school operations in 8 States, with the heaviest emphasis in the most-rural. (p. 35)

When asked to evaluate the suitability of local revenue sources in their States, a definite majority of the respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the current situation. This was most evident in property taxes, where a need for local property tax relief was cited by 66% of all respondents. (p. 36) The unanimity of opinion is here impressive, especially since 53% of the respondents cited a need for property tax relief without being asked specifically about property taxes; when directly asked, an additional 13% felt relief was needed. (p. 36)

In addition to dissatisfactions with property tax rates, numerous respondents (2/3 of them, from 43 States) felt that their State's assessment procedures were inequitable. (p.37) Respondents often perceived these inequities to arise from inadequate selection, training, and supervision of assessors, sometimes complicated by lack of standards and procedures for valuation. (p.38) Inequitability was slightly more apt to be perceived by respondents representing suburban areas than those from urban or rural areas (75%, compared to 60% and 66% respectively--p.37), and inequities tended to be more frequently reported by the more rural States. (p.37) The comments of those respondents who cited inequities often reflected a discrimination against urban property, sometimes suggesting that farm properties were more difficult to classify and value. Other respondents felt that residential properties, wherever located, were discriminated against. (p.38) Thirty-five of the 65 respondents who reported inequities indicated that a uniform, State-wide property tax might help alleviate the problem. (p. 39)

A few respondents perceive the need for change in existing local income taxes, primarily rate increases, and there exists some sentiment for increasing the rates of local excises. (p.36) On the other side of the coin, 23% of all respondents believe that localities should tax some things that are not now taxed. This opinion centers in the predominantly-urban States and focusses on adding local taxes on personal and business income. (p.40)

Federal Revenues

Survey respondents were asked to make first and second choices, on the matter of Federal aid form only, among categorical programs, a general aid program, and the kind of grant consolidation and simplification represented by President Nixon's proposal for "Special Revenue Sharing for Education." The overwhelming first choice was for general aid to education (62%) with Special Revenue Sharing for Education receiving half that support (31%). Categorical programs were least preferred, with 7% selecting them as a first choice and 19% choosing them second. The chairmen's opinion about categorical programs reflects the criticisms heard nationally and generally about this form of grant. (p.41)

Another of President Nixon's legislative proposals, for General Revenue Sharing with the States and their localities, received the strong support of this group. On a national basis, almost three-quarters of the survey respondents favor passage. (p.42) In addition to favoring General Revenue Sharing, the chairmen believe that passage would favorably affect school finance in their States. In answer to a separate question, 59% reported that "about half" of the additional money accruing to their State would likely be used for additional educational expenditures, and 22% think that "almost all" of the benefits would be so spent. (p.43) The chairmen also strongly favor passage of another proposal affecting the Federal financing of welfare programs. Those in favor account for 72% of the respondents, with the strongest support coming from the most heavily urbanized States and from representatives of urban districts. Here, again, respondents believe that enactment of the welfare proposal would favorably affect the school finance picture in their States by freeing funds now spent on welfare. A majority (53%) believe that about half of the relief would be used to help school programs and another 20% believe that almost all of the funds would be applied to education. (pp. 44, 45)

Intergovernmental Revenue Issues

Intergovernmental flows of funds have been part of school financing ever since States applied their own moneys to the operation of the local schools, and the addition of Federal money has compounded the intergovernmental nature of school finance. A number of survey questions were addressed to this aspect of school finance and it is clear that the survey population is in favor of some changes.

A majority of the chairmen believe that localities are doing enough in the way of raising revenue for the support of the schools. More than half (56%) disagreed with the proposition that localities should increase their efforts to raise more revenues and slightly over one-third (37%) agreed. Respondents in the most highly urbanized States, as well as those representing suburban districts (70% each) were most adamant that local funding should not be increased. The strong belief on the part of respondents representing suburban districts that local levels of government are currently doing enough is very probably connected with the view of this same group that State revenues are not adequate for present programs. (p.46)

The current sources of local revenues for the school undoubtedly affect the attitudes of respondents on the issue of local tax effort. The property tax is in general disrepute, but it is the primary source of local financing. Respondents who desire local property tax relief were asked: "What is the alternative for the schools?" The most popular option (92%) was for additional State assistance. Additional Federal assistance also received strong support (78%). The selection of other local taxes in replacement of the property tax was 20%. The fourth option, cutting back on educational programs, was regarded as appropriate by 10%. (p.47)

One intergovernmental finance issue that had shaped up as important in the Commission's deliberations at the time this survey was designed was related to full, or substantially full, State financing of the local schools. After the survey was underway, this issue was heightened in importance by the California Supreme Court's preliminary decision in

Serrano vs. Priest, which cast doubt that equal protection of the laws results from State reliance on local taxation to operate schools, and by subsequent similar cases in several State and Federal courts.

For purposes of the questionnaire, "substantially full" State financing was defined as 75% or more coming from State revenue sources. Nationally, the respondents favor substantially full State financing 2 to 1. It already exists in 6 States and 91% of those respondents favor it. In those States that do not have substantially full State financing, 63% favor the idea. (pp. 48, 49)

Respondents were asked to specify the percentages of funds they thought should be provided by local, State, and Federal sources. Results were consistent with those reported above. On the average, respondents believe that the Federal share of school finance should increase from the present 7% to 20%. The preferred State share would average 60%, compared to the present 41%, and the local share would be decreased to approximately 20%. (p. 50)

DISTRIBUTION OF STATE FUNDS

The part of the survey dealing with distribution of State funds sought the attitudes towards current State patterns and desired changes in these patterns.

Virtually all respondents indicated that the basic pattern of aid in their States was related to the number of pupils in each school district. Only 4% of all respondents indicated that all school-age children, including those enrolled in nonpublic schools, are included in State aid programs. Only 1% of the respondents reported that cost differentials were utilized in providing additional funds for pupils from low-income families. (This is not to be construed that only 1% of the States are, in fact, providing additional funds for low-income pupils.)

Increased emphasis in the aid formulae to take into account cost differentials for educating children from low-income families would be favored by 24%, for educating children with low achievement scores by 25%, for educating pupils from minority groups by 23%, and for including nonpublic pupils by 9%. Five percent believe that the emphasis on district enrollment should be decreased. (p. 51)

A plurality (41%) of the chairmen believes that their State's aid plan treats urban districts, suburban districts, and rural districts equally. The second most-numerous view (24%) holds that existing aid plans favor rural districts. (p. 52)

In all but 6 States, full or substantially full State financing would represent a significant departure from present aid distribution. In the view of the majority of education committee chairmen, this change *would* improve the equalization of tax effort (77%) and educational opportunity (78%) among the local districts.

The availability of special programs, such as special education, programs for educationally disadvantaged, and vocational programs, would also be improved according to 86% of respondents.

The respondents also believe that substantially full State financing would more nearly equalize expenditures per pupil. (p. 53)

In terms of feasibility, a majority of respondents nationally (56%) think that substantially full State financing would be *very difficult* to obtain, and another 31% believe that it would be *relatively difficult*. Only a 6% minority reported that such a change would be relatively easy to enact. Those who strongly favor the change to full State funding are slightly more optimistic about its prospects and respondents from the 10 States with the lowest proportion of State finance universally report that it would be difficult. (p. 54)

GOVERNANCE

A big issue in the intergovernmental relations of education is the question of function of each level of government involved--which level is going to decide which kinds of questions. This becomes particularly important when changes in the source of school funds are suggested and is most often embodied in the phrase "local control."

Respondents were questioned on their conception of "local control" in relation to six areas identified in the survey interview:

Teacher qualifications (beyond formal certification);
Hiring and firing of teachers;
Pupil-teacher ratios;
Salary schedules;
Curriculum;
Facilities.

Respondents were asked which of these functions had to be determined locally. Majority opinion conceived local control to be required in the areas:

Hiring and firing teachers (95%);
Facilities (71%);
Salary schedules (59%);
Curriculum (55%).

Local management was not necessary, in the majority view, with regard to pupil-teacher ratios (57% took this position, 38% opted for local control). On the issue of teacher qualifications, the respondents split almost evenly (48% for local control, 50% disagreeing). (p. 55)

Respondents were asked their views of the impact of full State funding on local control and program quality. The following opinions were expressed:

	Local Control Inhibited	Quality Aided	Both	Neither	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
Teacher qualifications	23	27	12	36	2
Hiring and firing of teachers	40	9	4	43	3
Pupil-teacher ratios	26	33	21	19	2
Salary schedules	27	40	22	9	2
Curriculum	25	34	18	23	1
Selection of principals	30	7	3	56	4
Selection of superintendents	27	8	2	59	4

(p.56)

Local control is regarded as educationally desirable by 82% of all respondents and as politically necessary by 72%. The strongest view on the educational desirability of local control was held by respondents who represent rural districts. The strongest recognition of the political factor comes from predominantly-urban States. (pp. 57, 58)

Another aspect of educational governance has to do with fiscal dependence or independence of local school boards for their local tax levies. A majority of respondents (52%) report that almost all local districts in their States are independent, while a substantial minority (43%) report dependence on a unit of general government. (According to the U.S. Office of Education, 90% of all school districts are fiscally independent.) (p. 59)

Those districts which are granted the independence to levy their own taxes generally have some kind of State-imposed check on the power. According to 70% of the respondents reporting independence, almost all districts are subject to absolute limits on the tax rate that can be levied and 61% report automatic referenda on proposed changes in the tax rate. Other limitations exist in the form of checks on the percentage of increase in rates or of referenda triggered by voter petition. (p. 60)

The education committee chairmen were asked their preferences regarding either fiscal independence, dependence, or reliance upon the State for their financing. The strongest position (67%) favored fuller State financing; 54% favored fiscal independence; and, 22% favored fiscal dependence on a local governmental body. (p. 61)

Respondents favor the election of local board members (89%) rather than appointment (7%). (p. 61)

Respondents were asked their views and opinions on the establishment of teachers' salaries and working conditions on the State level. State-level establishment of teachers' salaries is opposed by 46% of the respondents, while 44% approve. A majority (57%) believe that it would be difficult to set up. More think that it would ease the financial burden on local districts (44%) than think otherwise (38%). (p. 62)

The comparison of responses in favor of full State funding with the responses on State-level establishment of salaries appears to indicate no consistent body of opinion. The strongest proponents and the strongest opponents of full State funding both favor State-level establishment of salary schedules. (p. 62)

Opinion is evenly divided (at 41%) on the need for regional or other differentials, if salaries were to be established at the State level. All who perceive the need for differentials would include differentials in the cost of living in their State's regions, and lesser proportions think that living conditions, working conditions, and teacher shortages should also be reflected in any State-wide schedules. Antithetically, 43% think that State-established schedules should take into account the willingness of local districts to pay. (p. 63)

The respondent population is narrowly in favor of teacher tenure (51%), with the greatest support arising in the most urbanized States and the representatives of urban districts. Almost half (49%) believe that the tenure issue is a fit question for the negotiating table, if negotiations are used to establish salaries and other working conditions, as contrasted to a blanket establishment of tenure by law. The proponents of teacher tenure hold this view more strongly than the opponents of tenure. (pp. 64, 65)

More than three-quarters of the respondents (77%) believe that the membership of local and State boards of education should reflect the ethnic and socio-economic populations of the State. (p. 66)

Another persistent governance issue is that of local school district size. As has been true in the past, the problem of districts too large to administer effectively is not as widespread as the problem of districts that are too small. Respondents who represent the most urban States report the greatest incidence of districts too large. The favored remedy is decentralization within current legal districts (64%) rather than formal reorganization into smaller districts (27%).(pp. 67,68) Those reporting districts too small (77%) outnumber those reporting districts too large (34%). As a remedy for too-small districts, formal reorganization is chosen 2 to 1 over all other options combined. (pp. 69,70)

The most influential individual with regard to change in the State's school programs is generally considered to be the chief State school officer. He was selected by 44 respondents representing 31 States. The Governor, selected by 24 representing 20 States, was second. With regard to the most influential group, the State teachers' association was designated by 39 respondents, representing 28 States. State legislatures or their constituent organs were a distant second (16 respondents, 15 States) and State boards of education a close third (13 respondents, 11 States). (pp. 71,72)

EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Performance Contracting

Basic knowledge of this technique, which involves instruction by an outside organization guaranteeing results, in pupil-achievement terms, with payment geared to the degree of achievement attained, was not well-known by the respondents. On the basis of judgments made by the interviewers, only 29% of the respondents were knowledgeable about performance contracting. All performance contracting questions were presented to all respondents, however.

In the opinion of 69% of the respondents judged knowledgeable, performance contracting was seen as increasing student achievement. (p.73) On the cost side, opinion was more evenly divided: 45% believe that costs would increase, 28% think that costs would be lower, and 10% believe that there would be no change in costs. When the achievement side and the cost side are put together in a cost-effectiveness cross-tabulation, 24% would agree with the proponents of performance contracting that achievement would increase and costs decrease. Slightly more, 26%, hold that achievement would increase, but at greater cost. Achievement decrease-cost increase accounted for only 3%. (p.74)

Because of the cost-effectiveness link in the payment arrangements, 90% of the respondents judged knowledgeable believe that performance contracting provides a basis for educational accountability. (p. 75)

Education Vouchers

Attitudes regarding education voucher plans, whereby money is given to pupils' parents for payment for their children's education in schools of parents' choice, public or nonpublic, were obtained. Several aspects of these plans were explored in this survey, with respondents asked to assess the beneficial, harmful, or non-effects of voucher plans. This series of questions was analyzed in the light of the nonpublic enrollments of respondents' States, in recognition of the connection with the question of public support of nonpublic schools. No pattern of response could be discerned in connection with the variations in nonpublic enrollments.

Voucher plans would benefit educational innovation, according to 35% of the legislative respondents, while 25% believe that they would be harmful. Vouchers would increase per-student costs, in the view of 46% and have no cost impact according to 25%. Only 7% thought that vouchers would decrease costs. (p. 76)

Voucher plans are clearly seen as benefitting nonpublic schools (84%) and as harming public schools (61%). The adoption of voucher plans is seen as increasing racial and ethnic separation in the schools (62%). (pp. 77, 78)

Use of Achievement Tests

Educators and testing specialists tend to have divided views on standardized achievement testing, depending on which school subjects are under discussion. Apparently the issues are well-enough known to affect legislators' opinions. Pupil achievement tests were generally considered to be adequate measures of learning in the skills areas, such as reading and mathematics, but not in other subject areas.

Within the recognized limitations, the chairmen believe that achievement testing has its place in the management of educational programs and they are in favor of administering such tests on a State-wide basis.

Aside from the issue of scope of testing programs, the respondents prefer that results be compared with State or local norms, in preference to the national norms now used, and in preference to norms based on socio-economic homogeneity.

Another variation to current testing programs that is sometimes recommended is not to use norms at all, but to compare each individual's test score against some objectively defined body of knowledge and skills--"criterion-referenced" tests. Almost half (49%) of the chairmen would agree with that proposition. (p.79)

Programs for Disadvantaged Pupils

The focus of these questions was on the educationally disadvantaged, rather than on the physically handicapped or mentally retarded.

In the view of the respondents, adequate school programs for the disadvantaged require higher expenditures per pupil (91%), special teaching techniques (89%), and the mixture of both disadvantaged and advantaged pupils in the same classrooms (63%). (p.80) In addition to those responses, respondents mentioned most often the need for specially trained and motivated teachers. (p.81)

Many chairmen see inhibition to adequate programs for the disadvantaged in their States, arising from a lack of funds (77%) and a shortage of qualified personnel (63%). A majority (57%) did not think that such programs were held back by unfavorable political or social climates, but over one-third (38%) did. The state of the pedagogical art is seen as the cause of inhibiting programs for the disadvantaged by 46% of the respondents. (p.82)

In addition to programs for the disadvantaged, 29% of the respondents report that lack of funds, shortages of personnel, political factors, or the state of the art is hurting programs affecting bi-lingual education, pre-schooling, and special education in their States. (p.83)

School Age and Attendance Requirements

Addressing the lower end of the school age spectrum, a significant number of respondents (64%) believe that pupil achievement would be enhanced by lowering the age for formal, tax-supported education. Of those respondents, one-third (35%) believe that the age should be lowered to 5 years, in essence, the provision of kindergarten. Others would go even lower; 27% to age 4, 21% to age 3, and 2% down to age 2. (p.84)

At the upper end of the age spectrum, the most common compulsory-attendance age was reported to be 16. While a majority (54%) favor no change to formal age and grade attendance requirements, more flexible and innovative administration is favored. More pragmatic courses in high school are favored by 39% and special skills training centers apart from high school were selected by 58%. In addition, respondents would permit a greater incidence of early graduation from high school by accelerating course work (62%) and some (18%) would permit students to take a year off from high school and then return for completion. Easier withdrawal (52%) and very easy return (77%) to high school are favored. (pp. 85,86)

When asked to volunteer suggestions about what to do with high school dropouts, more respondents suggested special vocational, trade or technical schools (27 responses) than any other approach. (p. 87)

Educational Research and Development

Education spends less on research and development than other "industries" or fields of endeavor, according to 76% of the survey respondents. There is little difference in views by degree of urbanization of respondent's State, the type of district represented, or whether respondent's State is in the top ten or bottom ten in terms of State finance. (p. 88)

The chairmen are not satisfied with this situation, 81% believing that research and development expenditures should be increased, but they believe that such increase would be difficult in their States (66% difficult, only 12% easy). (pp. 89, 90)

Other Program Management Issues

A modest majority (56%) agree that teachers from an ethnic minority are more effective in teaching children of that minority. This view was held most strongly in the more urban States and by representatives of urban districts, and least strongly by respondents from the predominantly-rural States and representatives of suburban districts. Nationally, 15% reserved judgment on the question and 5% had no opinion. (p. 91)

In the structured portion of a question seeking the definition of "accountability," most respondents selected "good student achievement" (66) and the second most popular choice was "businesslike management practices" (58). In the open-ended portion of the question, "audit of accomplishments" was suggested more often than any other attribute (10 mentions). (p. 92)

An open-ended question sought respondents' suggestions for improving the efficiency of education. Ninety respondents, representing 48 States, had suggestions. Seven did not. Most suggestions touched on subjects covered during the previous questioning.

The most numerous suggestion for improving efficiency centered around the consolidation of small school districts or the provision to small districts of support services on a consolidated basis (22 mentions). The installation of programming-planning-budgeting systems or other accountability techniques and the improvement of evaluation methods was second-high (20 mentions). Review and change in curriculum were also perceived as desirable (17 mentions), and improvement of facilities utilization and financial aid distribution rated next (16 mentions each). (p. 93)

ATTITUDES TOWARDS NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

The education committee chairmen were asked their views regarding public aid to nonpublic schools. Generally, they are not in favor. A majority (58%) disagreed that a school-aged child is entitled to State support of his education regardless of the school attended. In addition to looking at the national response, analysis of the nonpublic school aid questions included review of the responses according to the percentage of nonpublic school enrollments in respondent's State, in four classes: Under 5%; 5--10%; 10--15%; and More than 15%. Only respondents from States with more than 15% nonpublic enrollment favored aid to nonpublic schools in answer to this question. (p. 94)

Two-thirds of all respondents believe that parents who wish to provide a nonpublic education for their children should not expect the taxpayers to contribute. (p. 95)

Respondents were asked if the issue of public aid to nonpublic schools should be decided locally. Only 18% of all respondents selected local option. Local option was the most popular in the States with under 5% nonpublic enrollment. (p. 96)

In order that possible public aid to nonpublic schools not contribute to racial or ethnic isolation, one suggested alternative would require open enrollment as a condition for public support. The chairmen favor (70%) this idea. (p. 97)

One argument advanced for public aid to nonpublic schools is that if the nonpublic schools close because of financial difficulty, the burden on the taxpayers will be greater because the public schools will have to absorb these children and therefore it would be better to provide funds directly to nonpublic schools. This argument is not persuasive with 60% of all respondents. It *is* persuasive with 61% of the respondents from States with more than 15% nonpublic enrollment. (p. 98)

Finally, a public school-oriented alternative calling for special State aid to assist public schools impacted by the closing of nonpublic schools received the approval of 79%. Even respondents representing States with the highest nonpublic enrollments favored this approach in a majority proportion (61% in favor vs. 39% opposed). (p. 99)

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The opinions of the 97 chairmen of State legislature education committees interviewed in this survey would support substantial changes in the way elementary and secondary schools are financed and operated. Indeed, by their own assessment, their support for some of these changes is greater than the support they sense elsewhere in the body politic, rendering the changes difficult.

In the opinion of this group, State revenues are inadequate for today's programs and levels of support of education, without taking into account changes the chairmen would like to see which would increase State burdens. Nevertheless, this group holds that States should do more, principally, raising the level of State financial support to the local schools to the 75--100% range. Fuller State finance would improve the equalization of tax burdens among localities and enhance equality of educational opportunity, but it would be difficult to achieve.

States should place greater reliance on income taxation, adopting it in cases where it is not now used, and raising rates in many States that now have income taxes. Real and personal property taxes are in general disfavor with these respondents. Where they are used as State taxes, rates should be lowered or held constant. Local property tax relief is needed and should be financed by additional State or Federal aid. The chairmen believe that localities should not be called upon to raise more revenues, from any source.

Local property tax assessment procedures are inequitable and the inequities seem to be more frequently reported by rural States. Converting the property tax from a local to a State tax would help eliminate the inequities.

Greater Federal assistance is called for, to just under 20% of school costs. A program of general aid to education would be the preferred form of increased assistance. The proposed Special Revenue Sharing for Education is favored. The passage of General Revenue Sharing and increased Federal finance of welfare programs are generally regarded as desirable and are anticipated to result in substantial additional funding for education in the States.

Substantially full (75--100%) State finance of the local schools is favored and judged to improve the equalization of educational opportunity and tax burdens. It would result in long range quality improvements, but would tend to inhibit local control with respect to some aspects of school management that respondents believe important for local control. Other control aspects would be inhibited, but they were not judged important for local retention.

Fiscally independent local school boards are favored over fiscally dependent boards, but the preferred solution is heavier State finance which would reduce local boards' taxing responsibilities.

It is not necessary or desirable to lodge the establishment of teachers' salaries and working conditions at the State level.

A majority favors teacher tenure, but approves making the issue negotiable along with other working conditions and salaries.

Local school districts that are too small continue to be a more prevalent problem than districts that are too large. The favored remedy for small districts is formal reorganization into larger districts. In cases where districts are too large, the most popular solution is decentralization within present districts, rather than formal reorganization.

The most influential individual in matters of change in State school programs is seen as the chief State school officer in most cases. Governors were cited by the second-largest group of respondents. In assessing the impact of groups on educational change, State teachers' associations were designated most often, followed by legislatures and State boards of education.

Those respondents judged to be knowledgeable about performance contracting believe that the technique would improve student achievement, raise costs, and provide a suitable basis for accountability.

Educational voucher plans are seen as benefitting educational innovation and nonpublic schools, as raising costs, as harming public schools, and as increasing racial and ethnic separation.

Achievement testing is approved as a valid measure of learning in reading and mathematics, but not in other subject areas. Testing programs should be conducted on a State-wide basis and are seen as valuable tools of school management.

Programs for disadvantaged pupils are inhibited by practical considerations, such as lack of funding and shortages of qualified personnel, rather than by unfavorable political or social climates.

The chairmen favor lowering the age for the start of formal, tax-supported schooling. A few would take it as low as age 2, but the consensus is centered on 4 or 5.

Little change in legal requirements for maximum age or grade attendance is favored, but there is definite favor for more flexible and innovative administration, especially in terms of broader based, vocational activities.

457-206 O - 72 - 3

Too little is spent on educational research and development and States should do more in this field. An increase in expenditures would be difficult.

Suggestions for improving the efficiency of school programs emphasized the consolidation of small districts and the installation of accountability/evaluation systems.

The education committee chairmen do not favor public aid to nonpublic schools. Favorable sentiment was highest in the States with the highest proportion of nonpublic school pupils, but the national conclusion was unfavorable.

STATISTICAL DATA, REVENUE SOURCES

THE QUESTION: Which of the listed sources of state taxes are now major sources of revenue in your state? (#2 on the Guide)

Which two provide the most benefit to education? (#3)

Do you believe that any of the sources marked should not be a state tax? (#4)

Are there other sources of revenue which you believe your state should tax that it is not taxing now? (#5)

Should the rates on the existing taxes be increased, decreased, or should they not be changed? (#6)

(The answers to this series of questions are presented on the table following.)

REVENUES AT STATE LEVEL (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES)

		Major Source	Benefits Education	Should Not Tax	Should Tax But Not Taxing Now	Increase Rate	Decrease Rate	No Change in Rate
1.	Personal Income	72	53	1	16	34	5	33
2.	Personal Property	23	2	9	1	1	14	7
3.	Real Property (or Transfer of Same)	38	15	9	4	7	16	15
4.	Sales (General)	87	67	3	6	31	17	40
5.	Motor Vehicle, Fuel and Road Taxes	87	3	1	1	24	3	45
6.	Excise Taxes (Cigarettes, Alcohol)	90	11	1	2	41	2	42
7.	Business Taxes	71	8	1	6	21	8	34
8.	Racing (Gambling, Lottery, etc.)	38	4	2	9	20	1	18
9.	Severance (Timbering, Mining)	26	3	0	8	14	2	12
10.	Value - Added	0	0	0	7	0	0	1
11.	Inheritance and Gift	61	2	1	5	11	7	37
12.	Other:							
	Corporation franchise	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Banking tax	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Billboard tax	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Hotel rooms	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Soft drinks	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	General Fund State - can't attribute use of Revenue to Education	-	37	-	-	-	-	-

THE QUESTION:

Based on present programs and levels of support, do you believe your state revenue is adequate to meet the needs of elementary and secondary education for today? (#1 in the Interviewer Guide, Appendix C)

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
National	28	69	1	2
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% Urban	50	50	0	0
50--70% Urban	17	78	2	2
More than 70% Urban	30	68	0	2
Respondents Representing:				
Rural Districts	27	69	2	2
Suburban Districts	22	78	0	0
Urban Districts*	25	73	0	2
Will it be adequate for the future?				
National	25	65	6	4
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% Urban	25	69	0	6
50--70% Urban	15	73	10	2
More than 70% Urban	35	55	5	5
Respondents Representing:				
Rural Districts	24	68	5	3
Suburban Districts	25	73	3	0
Urban Districts*	21	71	6	2

*The total number of respondents, so categorized, equals 143 because many of the 97 chairmen represent districts that are not exclusively rural, suburban, or urban.

THE QUESTION:

Are there any legislative measures in the works in your state now which would affect the present state revenue system for education? (#7 in the Guide)

	Yes %	No %	Don't Know %	No Answer %
National	56	32	2	10
Respondents Representing States:				
Less than 50% Urban	38	50	0	12
50--70% Urban	61	24	0	15
More than 70% Urban	58	32	5	5

THE QUESTION:

Which of the taxes listed are important sources of local revenue to education in your state? (#8)

	National	All Respondents	Respondents from States		
			Less than 50% Urban	50-70% Urban	More than 70% Urban
	No. of States*	%	%	%	%
Personal Income	5	8	6	2	15
Business/Industry Income	4	7	6	2	12
Sales	10	17	25	20	15
Property:					
Residential Non-farm	47	96	100	95	95
Business Property	46	95	100	95	92
Farm Property	43	89	94	88	88
Other	8	21	31	22	15

*Counts the frequency of responses from chairmen in lower houses. Because of the classification of Nebraska's single chairman as a lower house member and the exclusion from tabulation of one unuseable interview, the total number of respondents is 49, rather than 50. Conceivably, the count for each revenue source could be increased by 1.

THE QUESTIONS:

Are there sources of local revenue which are now taxed, ones that you feel either should not be taxed or should be taxed at a different rate? (#9)

(For respondents who did not mention property tax in answering #9): Your answers to the previous question did not include local property tax. Do you feel that local property tax relief is needed in your State? (#10)

	No. of Respondents	%
From Q. #9		
Local tax rates do not need changing	33	34
Property taxes (all forms combined)*		
Rates should be decreased or tax eliminated	51	53
Rates should be increased	3	3
Equitability should be improved within current rates	1	1
Other tax rates should be modified	3**	3
No opinion, other remarks	6	6
Total	97	100
From Q. #10 (Excluding those citing property taxes in Q. #9)		
Local property tax relief needed	13***	13

* A single mention of any form of property tax qualified a respondent to be counted under this category instead of any other category.

** Does not include respondents who mentioned property taxes in addition to other taxes.

*** Count includes only respondents who did not specifically mention property tax in Q. #9.

THE QUESTION:

Do you feel that local property tax assessment procedures are equitable throughout your state? (#13)

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
National	31	67	1	1
Respondents who believe that local property tax relief is needed	32	64	2	2
Respondents who do not believe that local property tax relief is needed	30	70	0	0
Respondents representing:				
Rural districts	32	66	2	0
Suburban districts	22	75	3	0
Urban districts	38	60	0	2
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% Urban	25	75	0	0
50--70% Urban	29	71	0	0
More than 70% Urban	35	60	2	2

THE QUESTION (Asked of 65 respondents who reported inequity in response to preceding question):

Can you describe the inequities? (#14)

Respondents representing 43 States described the inequities summarized below.

	No. of Respondents	%
Classification of taxpayers hardest hit:		
Farmers	4	6
Professionals	3	5
Businessmen	4	6
Poor people	3	5
Discrimination against properties located in:		
Urban areas	19	31
Suburban areas	5	8
Rural areas	2	3
Discrimination against residences	12	18
Various inequities impossible to classify, arising from inadequate selection, training and supervision of assessors, or due to procedural provisions	44	68

THE QUESTION: (Asked of 65 respondents reporting inequities):

Do you believe a uniform state-wide property tax would help cure any of the inequities? (#15)

	Yes	No	No Opinion
	%	%	%
National (65 respondents)	54	42	4
Respondents from States:			
Less than 50% Urban	38	62	0
50--70% Urban	70	30	0
More than 70% Urban	42	46	12
Respondents Representing:			
Rural districts	58	38	4
Suburban districts	54	39	7
Urban districts	63	30	7

THE QUESTION:

Do you feel there are sources of local revenue which are not now taxed which you feel should be taxed? (#9)

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
National	23	66	1	10
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% Urban	12	75	0	12
50--70% Urban	32	56	0	12
More than 70% Urban	18	72	2	8

What are your suggestions?

	No. of Suggestions
Personal income tax	7
Business/Industry income tax	5
General sales tax	3
Severance & related taxes	3
Payroll/Commuter taxes	2
Capitation tax	1
Personal property tax	1
Excise taxes on specified commodities and services	11
Total	33

THE QUESTION:

If your State were to receive a predetermined amount of money from the Federal Government and if you could elect which program the educational money was to come from, which program would you select? (#16)

If that program could not be used, what would be your second choice?

Type of Federal assistance	Order of Preference (First)	(Second)
Special Revenue Sharing for Education	31%	53%
Categorical Programs of national concern and emphasis	7%	19%
General aid to Education	62%	21%

THE QUESTION:

General Revenue Sharing is a Federal legislative proposal currently being discussed as potentially favorably affecting State finance. In this program Federal funds would be distributed to States according to formula, for State and local use, without Federal restrictions on their use.

Would you tend to favor or oppose such a program? (#17.1)

	Favor	Oppose	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
National	74	19	5	2
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% Urban	62	38	0	0
50--70% Urban	76	15	7	2
More than 70% Urban	78	15	5	2
Respondents Representing:				
Rural Districts	75	22	3	0
Suburban Districts	72	25	3	0
Urban Districts	67	25	6	2

THE QUESTION:

If your State were to receive new revenues from a General Revenue Sharing program, what proportion of these new funds would likely be used for additional educational expenditures? Would you say, "almost all of them," or "about half of them," or "very little of them," or "none of them?" (#18.1)

	Almost All	About Half	Very Little	None	No Opinion	Same As From State
	%	%	%	%	%	%
National	22	59	15	0	3	1
Respondents from States:						
Less than 50% Urban	19	62	19	0	0	0
50--70% Urban	24	56	15	0	2	2
More than 70% Urban	20	60	15	0	5	0
Respondents Representing:						
Rural Districts	27	56	14	0	2	2
Suburban Districts	17	69	8	0	6	0
Urban Districts	17	65	12	0	6	0

THE QUESTION:

Another Federal proposal being discussed concerns a Federal Financing of Welfare. In this program the State's responsibility for welfare activities would be taken over by the Federal Government. This should have the effect of releasing State funds now used in welfare for redistribution by the State into other activities.

Would you tend to favor or oppose such a program? (#17.2)

	Favor	Oppose	No Opinion
	%	%	%
National	72	21	7
Respondents from States:			
Less than 50% Urban	44	38	19
50--70% Urban	76	17	7
More than 70% Urban	80	18	2
Respondents Representing:			
Rural Districts	69	24	7
Suburban Districts	78	19	3
Urban Districts	85	10	4

THE QUESTION:

If State funds were released as a result of Federal Financing of Welfare, what proportion of the newly available money would likely be used for additional educational expenditures? Would you say "almost all of it," or "about half of it," or "very little of it," or "none of it?" (#18.2)

	Almost All	About Half	Very Little	None	No Opinion	Same As From State
	%	%	%	%	%	%
National	20	53	22	3	2	1
Respondents from States:						
Less than 50% Urban	19	50	25	6	0	0
50--70% Urban	15	59	20	2	2	2
More than 70% Urban	25	48	22	2	2	0
Respondents Representing:						
Rural Districts	24	53	17	3	2	2
Suburban Districts	22	50	17	6	6	0
Urban Districts	21	56	19	0	4	0

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement: "Localities should increase their efforts to raise more revenue." (#12)

	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	No Opinion	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%	%
National	16	21	3	23	33	4
Respondents from States:						
Less than 50% Urban	25	19	6	6	38	6
50--70% Urban	24	27	2	22	24	0
More than 70% Urban	5	10	2	30	40	8
Respondents Representing:						
Rural Districts	20	17	2	29	29	3
Suburban Districts	11	14	3	31	39	3
Urban Districts	17	25	0	25	29	4

THE QUESTION (Asked of the respondents who indicated need for local property tax relief):

How strongly do you agree or disagree that the local property tax relief should be financed...

	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	No Opinion	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%	%
...by other local taxes?	14	6	4	24	46	6
...by additional state assistance?	72	20	0	0	0	4
...by additional Federal assistance?	46	32	4	6	6	6
...by cutting back on education programs?	4	6	0	20	60	10

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you favor or disfavor the substantially full* State financing of education which exists in your State? (Asked of respondents in Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, New Mexico, and North Carolina: 12 respondents) (#19.1)

*Substantially full = 75%-100%

	12 Respondents	
	#	%
Strongly favor	7	58
Mildly favor	4	33
No opinion	0	0
Mildly disfavor	0	0
Strongly disfavor	1	8

THE QUESTION:

How strongly would you favor or disfavor the idea of substantially full... that is, 75 to 100%...State financing of education in your State? (Asked of 85 respondents in 44 States other than those where Q. 19.1 used) (#19.2)

	85 Respondents	
	#	%
Strongly favor	37	44
Mildly favor	16	19
No opinion	1	1
Mildly disfavor	12	14
Strongly disfavor	17	20
No Answer	2	2

(In combination, the responses of the two groups answering Questions 19.1 and 19.2 would show opinion regarding full or substantially full State finance of education without regard to whether respondents' States now had substantially full State financing or not. The combined responses would be:

	Strongly Favor %	Mildly Favor %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disfavor %	Strongly Disfavor %	No Answer %
National	45	21	1	12	19	2
Respondents from States:						
Less than 50% Urban	50	19	0	6	25	0
50--70% Urban	49	20	0	15	17	0
More than 70% Urban	40	23	2	12	18	5
Respondents Representing:						
Rural Districts	42	20	0	10	25	0
Suburban Districts	42	22	3	11	17	6
Urban Districts	42	23	2	17	17	0

THE QUESTION:

The list below shows the percentages of educational funds for your State which come from Federal, State, and local sources, as published by the Office of Education for 1969-70. If you had your way, what would you rather have the percentages be? (#36)

	Percentage Share by Source		
	Local	State	Federal
1969-70 Actual:			
Low	3.9	8.5	3.2
Average	52.7	40.7	6.6
High	87.2	87.0	25.7
Preferred:			
Low	4.0	2.5	4.0
Average	26.3	59.6	18.1
High	80.0	99.0	97.5

STATISTICAL DATA, DISTRIBUTION OF STATE FUNDS

THE QUESTION:

Various States have various target areas and focus their State school aid toward one or more factors.

On which of the factors listed below is your State focusing its State school aid plans? (#23)

If you have any dissatisfaction with the present focus, which of these factors should be increased and which should be decreased? (#24)

Focus of State School Aid	Present Focus	Emphasis Should be Increased	Emphasis Should be Decreased	No Change	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
On school district enrollments or attendance	79	18	5	40	37
On differences in costs of educating pupils:					
from low income families	1	24	1	15	60
with low achievement scores	0	25	4	13	58
from minority groups	0	23	3	13	61
On all pupils, private and/or public	4	9	2	15	73
Others factors	15	-	-	-	-

THE QUESTION: In your opinion does distribution of your state's school aid favor.... (#25)

		Respondents Representing		
	National %	Rural Districts %	Suburban Districts %	Urban Districts %
Urban Districts	15	20	3	12
Suburban Districts	7	7	11	6
Rural Districts	24	17	19	23
No Opinion	9	8	6	6
All Treated Equally	41	44	56	46
No Answer	3	3	6	6

THE QUESTION (Asked of 12 respondents whose States have substantially full State funding):

Do you think that substantially full State financing of education has improved the equalization of any of the following factors in your State? Has it improved the equalization of... (#20.1)

	Yes	No	No Opinion
	%	%	%
...Tax effort?	65	28	7
...Educational opportunity?	85	15	0
...Expenditures per pupil?	92	8	0
...Availability of special programs?	86	14	0

THE QUESTION (Asked of the other 85 respondents):

Do you think that substantially full State financing of education would improve the equalization of any of the following factors in your State? Would it improve the equalization of... (#20.2)

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
...Tax effort?	80	16	4	0
...Educational opportunity?	77	20	2	0
...Expenditures per pupil?	81	14	4	1
...Availability of special programs?	86	12	2	0

(A combined look at the responses to Questions 20.1 and 20.2, wiping away the distinction between those States which do and do not now provide substantially full State financing of education, reveals the following respondent opinion about the equalizing effects of substantially full State finance:

Substantially full State financing has or would improve the equalization of...

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
...Tax effort.	77	18	4	1
...Educational opportunity.	78	20	2	0
...Expenditures per pupil.	82	13	3	1
...Availability of special programs.	86	12	2	0

THE QUESTION: (Asked of 85 respondents in states which do not have substantially full state financing.)

How difficult do you believe it would be to obtain substantially full state financing in your state? (#21)

	It Already Exists %	Very Difficult %	Relatively Difficult %	No Opinion %	Relatively Easy %	Very Easy %	No Answer %
National	1	56	31	1	6	0	5
Respondents who strongly favor full state financing	2	41	30	0	7	0	20
Respondents who strongly disfavor full state financing	0	67	22	0	0	0	11
Respondents from the 10 states with the greatest degree of state financing	0	25	20	0	5	0	50
Respondents from the 10 states with the lowest degree of state financing	0	74	26	0	0	0	0

STATISTICAL DATA, GOVERNANCE

THE QUESTION: Regardless of where the funds come from, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

Decisions relating to the factors listed below must be retained at the local level. (#22)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	No Answer %
Teacher qualifications	41	7	1	22	28	1
Hiring and firing of teachers	79	16	0	2	1	1
Pupil-to-teacher ratios	24	14	2	31	26	3
Salary schedules	36	23	2	15	21	3
Curriculum	24	31	2	24	18	2
Facilities	45	26	4	15	6	3

THE QUESTION: Now let me return briefly to the question of state financing of education.

It is possible that local control and initiative would be interfered with or inhibited by substantially full state funding of education. For which of the items listed below would this be true in your state?

It is also possible that substantially full state funding of education would, in the long run, provide for a high quality of education. Again, referring to the items listed below, for your state, which of them would be aided by state funding of education? (#26)

	Local Control Inhibited	Quality Aided	Both	Neither	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
Teacher qualifications	23	27	12	36	2
Hiring and firing of teahcers	40	9	4	43	3
Pupil-teacher ratios	26	33	21	19	2
Salary schedules	27	40	22	9	2
Curriculum	25	34	18	23	1
Selection of principals	30	7	3	56	4
Selection of superintendents	27	8	2	59	4

In the table below, the opinions of the strongest proponents and the strongest opponents of substantially full state finance were compared with the national respondent population. The factors selected omitted the two for which a clear majority selected "Neither." The percentage of respondents selecting "Local Control Inhibited" and "Both" were combined and posted in the table as a negative score. The percentage selecting "Quality Aided" and "Both" were combined and included as a positive score.

	Teacher Qualifications	Hiring/ Firing Teachers	Pupil-Teacher Ratios	Salary Schedules	Curriculum
National	-35 +39	-44 +13	-47 +54	-49 +62	-43 +52
44 Respondents who strongly favor substantially full state financing	-37 +39	-32 +13	-43 +61	-46 +66	-37 +64
18 Respondents who strongly disfavor substantially full state financing	-50 +45	-84 + 6	-67 +39	-67 +45	-73 +39

THE QUESTION: To what extent do you agree or disagree that local control in your state is educationally desirable? (#35)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %
National	43	39	5	9	3
Respondents from States:					
Less than 50% urban	31	50	6	12	0
50-70% urban	44	41	0	10	5
More than 70% urban	48	32	10	8	2
Respondents Representing:					
Rural districts	46	41	3	10	0
Suburban districts	44	36	8	8	3
Urban districts	33	44	8	10	4
44 Respondents who strongly favor substantially full state financing	39	39	5	14	5
18 Respondents who strongly disfavor substantially full state financing	50	33	6	6	6

THE QUESTION: To what extent do you agree or disagree that local control in your state is politically necessary? (#35)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	No Answer %
National	51	21	3	18	6	2
Respondents from States:						
Less than 50% urban	38	25	6	25	0	6
50-70% urban	54	24	0	17	5	0
More than 70% urban	52	15	5	15	10	2
Respondents representing:						
Rural districts	51	24	2	15	7	2
Suburban districts	44	19	0	25	8	3
Urban districts	56	17	2	21	4	0
44 Respondents who strongly favor substantially full state financing	52	23	2	18	5	0
18 Respondents who strongly disfavor substantially full state financing	50	22	6	17	6	0

THE QUESTION: The fiscal powers of local school districts vary within different states. Will you please tell me approximately how many of the school boards in your state:

(a) independently levy taxes? Would you say "almost all" of them, "some" of them, or "none" of them independently levy taxes?

(b) about how many depend on a unit of general government for levy?

(c) and how many depend on a special levy authority? (#27)

Method of Levy	Number of Local School Boards Almost All	Some	None	Don't Know	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
Independently levy taxes	52	6	37	1	4
Depend on a unit of general government for levy	43	8	36	1	11
Depend on a special levy authority	8	11	59	2	20

Respondents reporting that "Almost All" or "Some" in their States:	National	Respondents from States Less than 50% Urban	50%-70% Urban	More than 70% Urban
	%	%	%	%
Independently levy taxes	58	50	59	60
Depend on a unit of general government for levy	51	56	49	52
Depend on a special levy authority	19	12	15	18

THE QUESTION: (Asked of the 56 respondents who indicated that "Some" or "Almost All" of the local school boards in their States independently levy taxes.) Approximately how many school districts have state-imposed limitations on the local school tax? (#28)

Type of Limitation	Almost All %	Some %	None %	Don't Know %	No Answer %
Limits on absolute tax rate	70	7	20	0	3
Limits on percentage of increase in tax rate	39	4	48	2	7
Automatic referenda on change in tax rate	61	4	32	0	4
Referenda by petition on change in tax rate	12	4	75	7	2

THE QUESTION: What are your personal feelings about the financial structure of school boards? How strongly do you agree or disagree that school boards should be.... (#29)

	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	No Opinion	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%	%
....financially independent	34	20	1	16	25	4
....dependent on a local unit of general governance?	10	12	2	19	53	4
....financed by the state	33	34	2	9	16	5
....elected rather than appointed?	82	7	0	3	4	3

A recapitulation of the issue of financial independence or dependence shows:

	Favor Financial Independence	Favor Financial Dependence
	%	%
National	54	22
Respondents from States:		
Less than 50% urban	62	31
50-70% urban	56	20
More than 70% urban	58	22
Respondents representing:		
Rural districts	54	24
Suburban districts	53	14
Urban districts	50	19

THE QUESTION: In many states, teachers' salaries and working conditions are established by professional negotiations or collective bargaining between teachers and local school boards, and the practice seems to be growing. It has been suggested that teachers' salaries be established on the state level. (#30)

	National			
	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
(a) Would this be desirable to your state?	44	46	3	6
(b) Would it be difficult to establish teachers' salaries at the state level?	57	35	0	8
(c) Would it ease the financial burden of education on the local districts?	44	38	10	7
(d) Would equally qualified and experienced teachers receive equal salaries regardless of where they teach?	41	41	8	9
Would this be desirable in your state?				
National	44	46	3	6
Respondents who strongly favor substantially full state financing	48	45	0	7
Respondents who strongly disfavor substantially full state financing	50	44	0	6
Would equally qualified and experienced teachers receive equal salaries regardless of where they teach?				
National	41	41	8	9
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% urban	38	38	12	12
50-70% urban	44	39	7	10
More than 70% urban	40	45	8	8
Respondents Representing:				
Rural districts	51	32	8	8
Suburban districts	28	50	8	14
Urban districts	29	54	10	6

THE QUESTION: (Asked of 40 respondents who answered "No" to Question 30 d.)

Your negative answer suggests that your state would need differentials in teachers' salary schedules in order to recognize differences in the various districts in your state. What are the important differences that would have to be recognized in your state? (#31)

Cost of living	100%
Working conditions	75%
Living conditions	75%
Districts with teacher shortages	50%
Differences in willingness of local districts to pay	43%
Other factors (16 responses)	40%

THE QUESTION: In the main, do you tend to be favorably or unfavorably disposed towards teacher tenure? (#33)

	Favorable %	Unfavorable %	No Answer %
National	51	46	3
Respondents from States:			
Less than 50% urban	50	44	6
50-70% urban	44	56	0
More than 70% urban	58	38	5
Respondents Representing:			
Rural districts	49	49	2
Suburban districts	48	50	3
Urban districts	50	46	4

THE QUESTION: If negotiations are used to establish salaries and working conditions, should they also include the issue of teacher tenure? (#34)

	Yes %	No %	No Opinion %	No Answer %
National	49	39	6	5
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% urban	50	31	12	6
50-70% urban	61	37	0	2
More than 70% urban	38	45	10	8
Respondents Representing:				
Rural districts	51	41	3	5
Suburban districts	44	42	6	8
Urban districts	52	33	12	2
Respondents in favor of teacher tenure	59	31	2	8
Respondents opposed to teacher tenure	40	51	7	2

THE QUESTION: How much do you agree or disagree that both local and state boards of education should reflect the ethnic and socio-economic populations in your state? (#37)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	No Answer %
National	43	34	2	11	7	2
Respondents from States:						
Less than 50% urban	44	25	6	12	6	6
50-70% urban	49	37	2	5	5	2
More than 70% urban	38	35	0	18	10	0
Respondents Representing:						
Rural districts	49	32	0	8	7	3
Suburban districts	33	42	3	14	6	3
Urban districts	40	31	2	17	8	2

THE QUESTION: Districts within the states vary by size. Some find the districts in the state too large or too small for different reasons. (#38)

Do you feel that your state contains some districts that are so large that administration of school districts is difficult or impossible?

	Yes	No	No Opinion
	%	%	%
National	34	63	3
Respondents from States:			
Less than 50% urban	6	88	6
50-70% urban	37	63	0
More than 70% urban	42	52	5
Respondents Representing:			
Rural districts	37	59	3
Suburban districts	31	64	6
urban districts	35	60	4

THE QUESTION: (Asked of 33 respondents who believe that their states contain districts so large as to make administration difficult.)

Which of the following do you feel is the best way to improve the situation?

	Reorganize into Smaller Districts %	Decentralize within Legal Districts %	Other Solutions %
National	27	64	9
Respondents from States:			
Less than 50% urban	(no remedy offered by the 1 respondent in this group)		
50-70% urban	33	60	7
More than 70% urban	22	67	1
Respondents Representing:			
Rural districts	43	57	0
Suburban districts	40	50	10
Urban districts	24	65	12

THE QUESTION: Do you feel that your state contains some districts that are too small to operate effectively? (#39)

	Yes %	No %	No Opinion %	No Answer %
National	77	18	5	1
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% urban	75	12	12	0
50-70% urban	85	10	5	0
More than 70% urban	68	28	2	2
Respondents Representing:				
Rural districts	81	12	7	0
Suburban districts	81	17	0	3
Urban districts	81	15	4	0

THE QUESTION: (Asked of 74 respondents who believe that their states contain some districts too small for effective operation.)

Which of the following do you feel would be the best way to improve the situation? (#39)

	%
Reorganize into larger districts	67
Heavy state finance	8
Multi-district support services	18
State-provided support services	8

Analysis:	Reorganize into Larger Districts %	Other Options %
National	67	33
Respondents from States:		
Less than 50% urban	50	50
50-70% urban	69	31
More than 70% urban	59	41
Respondents Representing:		
Rural districts	60	40
Suburban districts	69	31
Urban districts	72	28

THE QUESTION: Who do you feel is the most influential individual with regard to change in your state's school programs right now? (#40)

	Governor	Chief State School Officer	Legislator	Other*	No Opinion/ No Answer
Number of Respondents(98)	24	44	9	14	7
Representing #__ of States	20	31	8	13	7

THE QUESTION: What group do you feel is the most influential with regard to change in your state's school programs right now? (#41)

	No. and % of Respondents	No. of States
State Teachers Association	39	28
State School Boards Association	6	5
Superintendent's Association	3	3
State Legislature & Organs Thereof	16	15
State Board of Education	13	11
State Department of Education	4	4
State PTA	3	3
Other Lay and Interest Groups	5	5
Other	5	5
No Opinion/ No Answer	4	4
	98	

Performance Contracting

(Interviewers probed for Respondents' understanding of Performance Contracting through the use of such questions as: "Have you worked with Performance Contracting?" "Have you had much exposure to Performance Contracting?" "What kind of luck has your State had with Performance Contracting?"

On the basis of the answers, interviewers assessed the knowledgeability of respondents on Performance Contracting as follows:

	%
Very knowledgeable	11
Somewhat knowledgeable	18
Little knowledge	37
No knowledge	21
No report	13)

THE QUESTION:

In your opinion, what effect do you believe the use of performance contracting would have on student achievement? (#42)

	Increases it	Decreases it	No Effect	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
National	43	3	6	41	6
Respondents judged knowledgeable	69	3	7	17	3

THE QUESTION:

In your opinion, what effect do you believe the use of performance contracting would have on per-pupil costs? (#42)

	Increases Costs	Decreases Costs	No Effect	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
National	28	13	11	43	4
Respondents judge knowledgeable	45	28	10	17	0

Cross-tabulation of the opinions of respondents judged to be knowledgeable of performance contracting shows the following views of the technique's educational effectiveness vs. its impact on costs.

Respondents who believe that costs would:	Effect on student achievement:			
	Increase	Decrease	No Effect	No Opinion
	%	%	%	%
Increase	26	3	3	0
Decrease	24	0	3	0
Not change	13	0	0	3
No opinion	5	0	0	21

THE QUESTION:

In your opinion, do you think performance contracting provides a basis for accountability? (#42)

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
National	62	14	21	3
Respondents judged knowledgeable	90	7	3	0

Education Vouchers

THE QUESTION:

Educational voucher plans are plans by which parents are given public funds to spend on their children's education in schools of their choice.

In your opinion, what effect do you believe education vouchers would have on... (#43)

...educational innovation?

	Beneficial	Harmful	None	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
National	35	25	15	23	2
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5%	17	28	17	34	3
5--10%	50	27	13	10	0
10--15%	30	20	25	25	0
More than 15%	44	22	6	22	6

...per-student costs?

	Increase Costs	Decrease Costs	No Effect	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
National	46	7	25	20	2
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5%	55	3	14	28	0
5--10%	37	10	37	13	3
10--15%	50	10	15	25	0
More than 15%	44	6	33	11	6

...nonpublic schools?

	Beneficial	Harmful	None	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
National	84	3	3	5	5
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5%	79	3	0	10	7
5--10%	93	3	3	0	0
10--15%	85	5	0	5	5
More than 15%	72	0	11	6	11

...public schools?

	Beneficial	Harmful	None	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
National	19	61	12	7	1
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5%	7	69	10	14	0
5--10%	23	63	7	7	0
10--15%	25	60	15	0	0
More than 15%	22	44	22	6	6

...racial and ethnic separation
in the schools?

	Increase Costs	Decrease Costs	No Effect	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%
National	62	7	15	12	3
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5%	69	3	10	17	0
5--10%	43	13	23	17	3
10--15%	85	0	10	5	0
More than 15%	56	11	17	6	11

Use of Achievement Tests

THE QUESTION:

Do you believe that pupil achievement tests are adequate measures of learning in reading and mathematics? (#63)

Yes 56% No 28% No Opinion 11% No Answer 5%

Do you believe that pupil achievement tests are adequate measures of learning in the other subjects? (#63)

Yes 34% No 47% No Opinion 11% No Answer 7%

THE QUESTION:

Do you believe that proper management of educational programs requires pupil achievement testing?
(Asked of respondents who answered "Yes" to either part of Question 63)

Yes 92% No 4% No Opinion 4%

In your opinion, should such tests be administered on a state-wide basis, or on a school-district basis?
(Asked of 68 respondents who answered "yes" to above)

Statewide basis	72%
School-district basis	26%
No response	1%

THE QUESTION:

When pupil achievement tests are used, do you believe the test results in your state should be compared against...

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
...Nationwide performance results?	72%	19%	3%	6%
...Statewide performance results?	85%	7%	2%	6%
...Local performance results?	80%	12%	3%	4%
...Performance results for the applicable socioeconomic group?	58%	27%	7%	8%

Would it be prefereable to have the test results in your state compared against a defined body of knowledge and skills rather than against test performance results?

Yes 49% No 23% No Opinion 22% No Answer 6%

Programs for Disadvantaged Pupils

THE QUESTIONS:

Do you feel that adequate school programs for the disadvantaged pupil require ..

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
...higher expenditures per pupil? (#45)	91	6	1	2
...special teaching techniques? (#46)	89	5	4	2
...both disadvantaged and other pupils in the same classroom? (#47)	63	15	18	4

THE QUESTION:

Apart from the things we have just mentioned, what do you think the requirements are for an adequate program for disadvantaged pupils? (#48)

Suggestions were made by 74 respondents, representing 47 States.

Suggestion	No. of Times Suggestion Mentioned
Specially trained, motivated teachers	24
Knowledge of needs, appropriate curriculum	17
Low pupil-teacher ratio/small classes	14
Adequate instructional materials/equipment	11
Parent education and/or participation	10
Health and nutritional services	7
Miscellaneous	33

THE QUESTION:

Do you think that programs for the disadvantaged are inhibited in your state by... (#49)

	Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer
	%	%	%	%
...a lack of funds?	77	22	0	1
...a shortage of qualified personnel?	63	30	5	2
...unfavorable political or social climates?	38	57	2	3

THE QUESTION:

In your opinion, is it the fundamental problem that we do not know how to teach the disadvantaged (#50)

Yes 46% No 49% No Opinion 3% No Answer 1%

THE QUESTION:

Considering these factors: Financial limitations, lack of qualified personnel, social or political climate, and the state of the art in teaching, do any particular programs come to your mind as being especially affected by these things? (#51)

Yes 29% No 39% No Opinion 14% No Answer 18%

If "YES," which programs do you feel affected?

(Although only 28 respondents answered "Yes" above, 39 respondents, representing 31 States, had specific suggestions.)

Program	No. of Times Program Mentioned
Bilingual	11
Head Start or pre-school	10
Other programs for disadvantaged and handicapped	10
Trade/Vocational/Technical	4
Reading improvement	3
Miscellaneous	8

School Age and Attendance Requirements

THE QUESTION:

In your opinion would pupil achievement and educational effectiveness be increased by lowering the age for formal, tax-supported education? (#52)

Yes 64%   No 35%   No Opinion 1%

(The 62 respondents answering "Yes" were asked:)

To what age do you feel it should be lowered?

Lower to age:	2	2%
	3	21%
	4	27%
	5	35%
	6	2%
	16	2%
No Answer		11%

THE QUESTION:

Most states require their pupils to attend school until they reach a certain age or a certain grade.

What is the nature of compulsory attendance in your state? (#53)

Age		Grade	
To age 14	1%	Thru grade 8	10%
15	1%	9	1%
16	65%	10	3%
17	6%	12	11%
18	20%	13	1%
No Answer	7%	No Answer	73%

THE QUESTION:

Many students who are compelled to attend school are dissatisfied with compulsory attendance. Suppose your state were to develop a plan for changing or abolishing compulsory attendance. Some program options which might be considered are listed below.

Assuming that the decision is yours, select one option from each part--one from Part A, one from Part B, and so on. (Continuation of #53)

PART A: AGE AND GRADE ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS Please select one.	%
Do not change current age or grade requirements.	54
Reduce age and/or grade requirements.	30
Eliminate age and/or grade requirements.	13
No Answer	3

PART B: CHANGES IN EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS Please select one.	
Do not change current educational offerings.	11
Provide large numbers of pragmatic courses in high school.	30
Provide special skills training centers apart from high school.	58
No Answer	1

PART C: CHANGES IN TIME REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION Please select one.	
Do not change current time requirements for graduation.	19
Permit students to graduate early by accelerating their coursework.	62
Permit students to graduate later by allowing them to elect one year off before completing high school (sabbatical system).	18
No Answer	2

PART D: CONDITIONS FOR WITHDRAWING FROM SCHOOL PRIOR TO GRADUATION Please select one.	
Students may withdraw at their request.	5
Students may withdraw when a judgment is made that they will not benefit from additional schooling.	52
Students may withdraw upon special authorization.	35
No Answer	8

THE QUESTION:

How difficult or easy would you make it for a student to come back to high school if he had withdrawn prior to graduation? (#53)

Very difficult	0
Relatively difficult	3%
No opinion	0
Relatively easy	18%
Very easy	77%
No answer	2%

THE QUESTION:

In your program, who would be the responsible authority for allowing a pupil to withdraw from school prior to graduation? (#53)

The pupil	10%
A teacher	3%
A group of teachers	16%
The principal	32%
The superintendent	21%
The school board	20%
A state agency	5%
The parents	28%
Other agents and combinations of the above	24%

THE QUESTION:

What should be done with the students who drop out under your program prior to graduation? What is a reasonable approach? (#53)

Approaches	No. Mentioning Approaches
Vocational/Trade/Technical schools	27
Occupational counselling and training	13
Dropout prevention programs in school	5
Schools to provide job placement services	5
Miscellaneous	19
No good approach	20

Educational Research and Development

THE QUESTION:

Compared to other "industries," would you say that education spends more, about the same, or less of its resources in research and development? (#54)

	More %	About the Same %	Less %	No Opinion %	No Answer %
National	7	8	76	7	1
Respondents from States:					
Less than 50% Urban	6	12	75	6	0
50--70% Urban	7	10	78	5	0
More than 70% Urban	8	5	75	10	2
Respondents Representing:					
Rural Districts	7	8	76	8	0
Suburban Districts	11	8	72	6	3
Urban Districts	12	10	75	2	0
Respondents Representing 10 States:					
With greatest degree of State finance	5	15	75	5	0
With lowest degree of State finance	5	5	74	16	0

THE QUESTION:

Should educational research and development be increased in your state? (#55)

	Yes %	No %	No Opinion %	No Answer %
National	81	13	2	3
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% Urban	88	12	0	0
50--70% Urban	78	15	0	7
More than 70% Urban	82	12	5	0
Respondents Representing:				
Rural Districts	81	14	3	2
Suburban Districts	83	14	3	0
Urban Districts	81	12	2	4
Respondents Representing 10 States:				
With greatest degree of State finance	85	15	0	0
With lowest degree of State finance	79	16	0	5

THE QUESTION:

How difficult do you think it would be to increase support of educational research and development in your state? (#55)

	Difficult %	Easy %	No Opinion %	No Answer %
National	66	12	7	14
Respondents from States:				
Less than 50% Urban	62	12	12	12
50--70% Urban	66	15	5	15
More than 70% Urban	68	10	8	15
Respondents Representing:				
Rural Districts	61	15	7	17
Suburban Districts	72	8	3	17
Urban Districts	73	8	6	12
Respondents Representing 10 States:				
With greatest degree of State finance	55	20	10	15
With lowest degree of State finance	58	16	5	21

Other Program Management Issues

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you agree or disagree that teachers from an ethnic minority are more effective in teaching that particular minority's pupils than are teachers from the majority group? (#44)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Reserve Judgment %	No Answer %
National	20	36	5	11	9	15	3
Respondents from States:							
Less than 50% Urban	12	31	19	6	19	12	0
50--70% Urban	17	41	5	7	2	22	5
More than 70% Urban	25	32	0	18	12	10	2
Respondents Representing:							
Rural Districts	15	36	2	10	15	19	3
Suburban Districts	11	36	11	11	11	17	3
Urban Districts	15	44	8	19	6	6	1

THE QUESTION:

Rapidly rising costs of education, bearing heavily upon the taxpayers, have created a demand to know where the education tax dollar goes and what it buys; a term has become associated with this demand--accountability--which has several current interpretations.

What does accountability mean to you? (#62)

(Interviewers probed for not more than two aspects of accountability.)

	Number of respondents mentioning
Businesslike management practices	58
Good student achievement	66
Adequate learning opportunities	34
Faculty sets good example for students	12
Well educated and experienced faculty	15
Active principal and superintendent	12
Good student behavior	14
Other (respondents suggestions):	
Establish goals and measurable criteria	5
Audit of accomplishments	10
Hold officials responsible to people	6
Miscellaneous	32

THE QUESTION:

In your state, what ways can you think of to improve the efficiency of education? That is, to provide equal or better education for the same or less money? (#66)

(Interviewers probed for and recorded up to 4 suggestions from each respondent.)

Answered by 90 respondents, representing 48 States. No answer from 7 respondents.

The suggestions are categorized as follows:

Suggestion	No. of times suggestion mentioned
Local district consolidation; multi-district support services	22
PPBS/accountability systems; improve evaluation techniques	20
Review, change curriculum	17
Improve facilities utilization; 12-month school	16
Increase State or Federal finance; better aid distribution; tax reform	16
Improve staff utilization; more flexible schools; team teaching; differentiated staffing	14
Improve teacher training (pre-service and in-service)	14
Revise, expand vocational programs	12
Teacher evaluation/merit pay/incentive pay; abolish tenure	11
Increase research into learning theory and to test innovations	10
Increase innovations, use of TV and other technology	10
Miscellaneous	76

457-206 O - 72 - 7

STATISTICAL DATA, NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"A school-aged child is entitled to state support of his education, regardless of the school he attends." (#56)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %
National (Average nonpublic 10.9%)	21	20	1	14	44
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5% (15 States, 29 respondents)	21	21	0	10	48
5--10% (15 States, 30 respondents)	20	13	3	20	43
10--15% (11 States, 20 respondents)	15	20	0	10	55
More than 15% (9 States, 18 respondents)	28	28	0	17	28

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Parents who wish to provide a private (nonpublic) school education for their children should not expect the taxpayers to contribute." (#57)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %
National	57	10	2	21	10
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5%	62	17	0	21	0
5--10%	67	0	3	20	10
10--15%	60	10	0	15	15
More than 15%	28	17	6	28	22

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Whether or not nonpublic schools should receive public funds should be determined locally." (#58)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %
National	9	9	1	11	69
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5%	17	10	0	10	62
5--10%	0	10	0	7	83
10--15%	15	5	5	5	70
More than 15%	6	11	0	28	56

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Open enrollment should be a condition for public support of nonpublic schools." (#59)

	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	No Opinion	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer
	%	%	%	%	%	%
National	60	10	9	5	3	2
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:						
Less than 5%	48	10	10	7	17	7
5--10%	63	7	13	0	17	0
10--15%	75	5	10	5	5	0
More than 15%	56	22	0	11	11	0

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"If the nonpublic schools close down because of financial difficulties the burden upon the taxpayers will be greater since the public schools will have to absorb these children. Therefore, it is better to provide funds directly to nonpublic schools." (#60)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	No Answer %
National	15	16	6	11	49	1
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:						
Less than 5%	7	21	10	10	48	3
5--10%	20	0	10	13	57	0
10--15%	15	15	0	5	65	0
More than 15%	22	39	0	17	22	0

THE QUESTION:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Rather than provide funds for nonpublic schools the States should be ready to assist any public school faced with sharply increased enrollments resulting from nonpublic school closings." (#61)

	Strongly Agree %	Mildly Agree %	No Opinion %	Mildly Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %
National	66	13	2	8	10
Respondents from States with nonpublic enrollments:					
Less than 5%	79	7	3	10	0
5--10%	60	20	0	13	7
10--15%	75	10	5	0	10
More than 15%	44	17	0	6	33

OPINION SURVEY OF STATE LEGISLATURE EDUCATION COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

APPENDIX A

PROJECT TIME SCHEDULE

	Plan	Actual
Project established	--	4/27/71
Initial definition of survey content	4/30	5/5
Mail out Request for Proposals	5/10	5/10
Bidders' conference	5/17	5/17
Receive proposals	5/24	5/24
Select contractor	5/28	--
(Original project split into two)	--	5/26
Receive revised proposals	--	6/3
Contract award	6/4	6/7
Initial meeting with contractor and review first draft of interview guide	6/8	6/10
Complete revision of guide for test interviews	6/15	6/25
Test interviews	6/23-25	6/28
Evaluate test interviews and revise guide	6/28-30	6/29
Interviewer training	7/12 & 13	7/12
(Revise interview guide)	--	7/13-15
Commence interview scheduling	6/30	7/16
First interview	7/14	7/18
Complete interview scheduling	9/3	9/16
Last interview	9/3	9/21
Data tabulation and analysis discussions	7/2-16	8/26
Analysis computations complete	9/17	9/27
Presentation of results to Commission staff	9/27-30	10/1*

	Plan	Actual
Contract termination	9/30	12/31**
Report summary	11/1	10/29
Oral report to Commission	11/5	11/5

*Delayed by ETS for convenience of Commission staff.

**Contract termination date revised to allow for consultation by ETS during additional analysis and interpretation of data and report drafting.

OPINION SURVEY OF STATE LEGISLATURE EDUCATION COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

APPENDIX B

LIST OF RESPONDENTS

Alabama

Senate

Don Horne
Chairman
Senate Education Committee
Interviewed July 22 and 23, 1971

House of Representatives

Pete Turnham
Chairman
House Education Committee
Interviewed July 22, 1971

Alaska

Senate

Lowell Thomas, Jr.
Chairman
Senate Health, Education, and Welfare Committee
August 12

House of Representatives

Genie Chance
Chairman
House Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare Committee
August 12

Arizona

Senate

Fred Koory
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
July 28

House of Representatives

Gladys Gardner
Chairman, House Education Committee
July 27

Arkansas

Senate

Clarence E. Bell
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 9

House of Representatives

Ode Maddox
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 6

California

Senate

Albert Rodda
Chairman, State Education Committee
August 11

Assembly

Leroy F. Greene
Chairman, Assembly Education Committee
August 9

Colorado

Senate

Chester K. Enstrom
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 5

House of Representatives

Jean K. Bain
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 4

Connecticut

Senate

James Murphy
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 16

Connecticut

House of Representatives

Howard M. Klebanoff
Chairman
Education Committee of the General Assembly
July 26

Delaware

Senate

Everette Hale
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
July 10

House of Representatives

Clarice U. Heckert
Chairman, House Education Committee
July 19

Florida

Senate

John R. Broxson
Chairman,
August 4

House of Representatives

Terrell T. Sessums
Chairman, House Education Committee
July 30

Georgia

Senate

Terral Starr
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 12

House of Representatives

Robert H. Farrar
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 3

Hawaii

Senate

Stanley I, Hara
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 23

House of Representatives

Akira Sakima
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 23

Idaho

Senate

John M. Barker
Chairman, Senate Health, Education and Welfare Committee
August 10

House of Representatives

Ernest Allen
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 10

Illinois

Senate

Esther Saperstein
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
July 28

House of Representatives

Carl W. Soderstrom
Chairman, House Education Committee
 (and Subcommittees on Elementary and
  Secondary Education)
July 29

Indiana

Senate

No Respondent

Indiana (Continued)

House of Representatives

Joseph D. Cloud
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 6

Iowa

Senate

Charlene Conklin
Chairman, Senate Committee on Schools
July 27

House of Representatives

Charles Grassley
Chairman, House Committee on Schools
August 17

Kansas

Senate

Joseph C. Harder
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
 (and School Finance Subcommittee)
July 28

House of Representatives

Raymond C. Vaughn
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 26

Kentucky

Senate

Clyde Middleton
Vice Chairman, Joint Interim Committee on Education
September 16

House of Representatives

Brooks Hinkle
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 13

Louisiana

Senate

Olaf J. Fink
Chairman, Senate Health, Education and Welfare Committee
August 5

House of Representatives

H. Lawrence Gibbs, Jr.
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 23

Maine

Senate

Bennett D. Katz
Chairman, Joint Legislative Committee on Education
August 12

House of Representatives

H. Sawin Millett, Jr.
Chairman, Joint Legislative Committee on Education
August 11

Maryland

Senate

George Snyder
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee
August 24

House of Delegates

John Hanson Briscoe
Chairman, House of Delegates Ways and Means Committee
September 1

Massachusetts

Senate

Mary L. Fonseca
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 18

Massachusetts (Continued)

House of Representatives

Michael J. Daly
Chairman, Joint Committee on Education
August 17

Michigan

Senate

Gilbert Bursley
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 5

House of Representatives

Lucille H. McCollough
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 13

Minnesota

Senate

Harold G. Krieger
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 24

House of Representatives

Harvey B. Sathre
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 23

Mississippi

Senate

Jack N. Tucker
Chairman, Senate Committee on Education
August 26

House of Representatives

Milton Case
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 25

Missouri

Senate

Nelson B. Tinnin
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 13

House of Representatives

P. Wayne Goode
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 12

Montana

Senate

Robert S. Cotton
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 6

House of Representatives

William S. Warfield
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 3

Nebraska

Senate (Unicameral)

Donald A. Elrod
Chairman, Education Committee
July 28

Nevada

Senate

Procter R. Hug
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
July 27

Assembly

Grover Swallow
Chairman, Assembly Education Committee
July 28

New Hampshire

Senate

Robert English
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 13

House of Representatives

Ray Bowles
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 20

New Jersey

Senate

Wayne Dumont, Jr.
Temporary Chairman, Senate Education Committee and member of Permanent Commission on State School Finance
July 26

General Assembly

John H. Ewing
Chairman, Assembly Education Committee
July 21

New Mexico

Senate

Aubrey Dunn
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 12

House of Representatives

Jose Chavez
Chairman, House Education Committee
July 27

New York

Senate

Thomas Laverne
Chairman, Senate Standing Committee on Education
August 4

New York (Continued)

Assembly

Constance E. Cook
Chairman, Assembly Committee on Education
August 19

North Carolina

Senate

Ralph Scott
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 17

House of Representatives

C. Graham Tart
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 13

North Dakota

Senate

Donald C. Holand
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 2

House of Representatives

Kenneth Knudson
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 10

Ohio

Senate

Oakley C. Collins
Chairman, Senate Education and Health Committee
August 3

House of Representatives

John A. Galbraith
Chairman, Education Subcommittee of House Finance Committee
August 5

Oklahoma

Senate

George A. Miller
Chairman, Senate Committee on Common Education
August 13

House of Representatives

Lonnie L. Abbott
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 12

Oregon

Senate

Victor Atiyeh
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 16

House of Representatives

Anthony Meeker
Chairman, House Committee on Health, Education and Welfare
August 16

Pennsylvania

Senate

Jeannette F. Reibman
Chairman, Senate Education Committee and Governor's Commission on School Finance
July 26

House of Representatives

James J. A. Gallagher
Chairman, House Education Committee
July 29

Rhode Island

Senate

Thomas N. Wilson
Chairman, Senate Committee on Health, Education and Welfare
September 21

Rhode Island (Continued)

House of Representatives

Joseph P. Thibaudeau
Chairman, House Committee on Health, Education and Welfare
August 11

South Carolina

Senate

James P. Mozingo
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
September 10

House of Representatives

Harold Breazeale
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 18

South Dakota

Senate

Henry A. Poppen
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 2

House of Representatives

Oscar E. Huber
Chairman, House Committee on Education
July 30

Tennessee

Senate

Halbert Harvill
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 13

House of Representatives

James H. Cummings
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 27

Texas

Senate

Oscar Mauzy
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 23

House of Representatives

Charlie Jungmichel
Chairman, House Committee on Education
August 16

Utah

Senate

Wilmer L. Barnett
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 19

House of Representatives

John E. Smith
Chairman, Standing Committee on Education
August 3

Vermont

Senate

Ellery R. Purdy
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 9

House of Representatives

Henry H. Carse
Chairman, House Education Committee
September 1

Virginia

Senate

Edward E. Willey
Ranking Member of Senate Committee on Public Institutions and Education
August 31

Virginia (Continued)

House of Representatives

W. Roy Smith
Vice-Chairman, House Committee on Education
September 1

Washington

Senate

Pete Francis
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
August 12

House of Representatives

Dale Hoggins
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 12

West Virginia

Senate

Mario J. Palumbo
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
July 29

House of Delegates

James W. Lohr
Chairman, House Education Committee
August 9

Wisconsin

Senate

Raymond F. Heinzen
Chairman, Senate Committee on Education
July 28

Assembly

Manny S. Brown
State Assembly Committee on Education
July 27

Wyoming

Senate

L. Don Northrup
Chairman, Senate Health, Education and Welfare Committee
August 6

House of Representatives

Allen E. Campbell
Chairman, House Committee on Health, Education and Welfare
August 2

Opinion Survey of State Legislature Education Committee Chairmen

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE

(Note: Material in the Interview Guide denoted by asterisks indicates instructions to interviewers and was not conveyed to respondents.)

Interviewer's checklist:

Before the interview:

1. Count the pages. You should have:
   - a. Title page
   - b. Appointment information Form
   - c. Introduction page
   - d. Pages 2-23, plus page 7.1. There should be printing on the back of pages 6 and 17.
   - e. Eight "Cards"
   - f. A table for use with Card #6. ( )
2. Make sure you have a marking pen for the respondent to use on Card #1 and a red pen for your recording. ( )
3. Enter information on the Appointment information form as given by telephone call. ( )
4. Enter name of state in Q. 7, p. 3. ( )
5. Enter three percentages from table in back of questionnaire into Card #6, p. 13. ( )
6. Enter same figures in Card # 6 in back of questionnaire.( )
7. Enter state's name (possessive case, e.g., "Maine's") in Q. 40, p. 15. ( )
8. Do the same for Q. 41, p. 15. ( )
9. Place all 8 Cards in pocket of 3-ring binder, install questionnaire into binder. ( )
10. If state is Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, New Mexico, or North Carolina, cross out

    Q. 19.2 on p. 7.1
    Q. 20.2 on p. 8
    Q. 21 on p. 8 ( )
11. If state is not one of those mentioned, cross out

    Q. 19.1 on p. 7.1
    Q. 20.1 on p. 8 ( )
12. Insure you have, on your person, copies of guarantee of anonymity and interviewer identification letter. ( )
13. Remove and discard this checklist when complete. ( )

President's Commission
on
School Finance

A Survey of State Legistative Chairmen

F. Reid Creech, Project Director
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Name of Interviewer: ______________________________

Name of Respondent: ______________________________

Appointment Information

Address: ______________________________

City, State: ______________________, ____________

Day, Date, Time: __________, ____________ ____,1971 at ______ am pm

Respondent's phone No.: (   ) - ______ - ________

Respondent Information

Legislative House Membership: ______________________________

Committee Respondent Chairs: ______________________________

Respondent's Legislative District is: Urban ( )
Suburban ( )
Rural ( )

Committee Responsibilities

Elementary and Secondary Education: ______________________________

Higher Education: Teaching Training: ______________________________

Other: ______________________________

State Institutions: ______________________________

Adult and Vocational: ______________________________

Non-educational Assignments: ______________________________

State Data (Not for interviewer use)

Public School Enrollment: Grades ________ - 12; __________pupils in 19___

Distribution of Enrollment: Urban ______%
Suburban ______%
Rural ______%
100 %

No. of School Districts in State: __________

Trouble: Call F. Reid Creech (609) - 921-9000, ext. 2960 (office)
or (609) - 737-0511 (home)

Tape recorders are attached to the telephones. If I am not available, please give your name, your current location, the date and time of your call, a number where you may be reached, and then give a summary of the problem.

* INTRODUCTION: Need not be followed exactly, but all
* pertinent information should be mentioned to respondent.
*
*
* Introduce and identify yourself and then say:

The President's Commission on School Finance has contracted with Educational Testing Service to conduct a series of interviews with state legislators who are knowledgeable in education and school finance.

I will be asking you a number of questions, largely concerning your opinions about the finances of primary and secondary education in your state.

The President's Commission has authorized ETS to guarantee the anonymity of our respondents, and we will not deliver any individual's data to the Commission. Only summaries will be released.

The questions will cover several broad areas and you may find that you do not know some of the answers, or that you have no opinion on certain issues. This is to be expected, especially since the same interview is being used in all fifty states.

[*Say to the Respondent] My first questions have to do with state revenues. Later I will ask you about local sources.

1. Based on present programs and levels of support, do you believe your state revenue is adequate to meet the needs of elementary and secondary education for today? and will be adequate in the future?

	Yes	No	DK
adequate for today	( )	( )	( )
adequate in the future	( )	( )	( )

⁑ Hand CARD #1 and marking pen to Respondent, then say:

This card lists various possible sources of state revenue; although your state's budget may be somewhat differently categorized, you can probably find most of your state's revenue sources listed one way or another on this card.

2. Would you please mark in column A each of the listed sources of state taxes that is now a major source of revenue in your state?

⁑ Wait until he is done, then say:

3. From which two of these sources which you have just named do you believe education receives the most benefit? Please mark your answers in column B.

⁑ Wait until he is done before going on.
⁑ If respondent indicates his is a General Fund state,
⁑ check here ( )
⁑ and say to respondent:

Then there is no need to make any entries in column B.

4. Do you feel that any of the sources marked in column A should not be a state tax? If so, please mark them in column C.

⁑ Wait until he is done, then say:

5. In addition to the sources you named in column A, are there any other sources which you feel should be taxed at the state level but currently are not? If so, please indicate them in column D.

* Wait until he is done, then say:

6. Now, please look at the first state revenue source you marked in column A. Do you feel that the tax rate for this source should be increased, should be decreased, or should not be changed? Mark an increase in column E, or a decrease in column F, or a "no change" in column G.

* Check to insure respondent does it correctly. Then say:

Good. Now, please do the same for each of the other state sources you marked in column A.

* Wait until he is finished, retrieve CARD #1, and check it over before proceding.

7. Are there any legislative measures in the works in [*name the state]_______________ now which would affect the present state revenue system for education?

Yes( )   No( )   DK( )

[* If YES]   What are they?

* Probe for names and/or descriptions of the legislation.

____

____

____

8. Now I would like to turn to local sources of revenue in your state.

* Hand CARD #2 to respondent. Then say:

This card lists some local sources of revenue. Some of them may not be taxed at the local level in your state. Of those which are taxed at the local level, which of them would you say are most important to education, that is, which of them provide at least 10% of the locally-developed revenues for education?

***** RECORD answers in column (a) below, then ask:

CARD #2

Local Sources of Revenue	(a) Now Taxed
Income	
Personal Income	( )
Business/Industry Income	( )
Sales	( )
Property	
Residental non-farm	( )
Business property	( )
Farm property	( )
Any other sources? Please specify ________________	( )

9. Are there sources of local revenue which are now taxed, ones that you feel either should not be taxed or should be taxed at a different rate?

Yes( ) No( ) DK( )

[* If YES, probe for source, direction of rate change or "should not be taxed."]

Source	Rate Should Be Increased	 Decreased	Should not be taxed
____________________	( )	( )	( )
____________________	( )	( )	( )
____________________	( )	( )	( )

Do you feel there are sources of local revenue which are not now taxed which you feel should be taxed?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

[*If YES, probe for sources]

____

____

____

10.[*If Respondent did not mention local property tax in Q. 9]

Your answers to the previous questions did not include local property tax. Do you feel that local property tax relief is needed in your state?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

11. [*If local property tax relief was cited in Q. 9 or Q. 10]

How strongly do you agree or disagree that the local property tax relief should be financed...

	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	No Opinion	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
...by other local taxes?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
...by additional state assistance?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
...by additional federal assistance?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
...by cutting back on education programs?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

12. How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Localities should increase their efforts to raise more revenue."

*Strongly agree ( )
*Mildly agree ( )
*No Opinion ( )
*Mildly disagree ( )
*Strongly disagree ( )

13. Do you feel that local property tax assessment procedures are equitable throughout your state?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

14. [*If NO] Can you describe the inequities?

Probe for: who is hardest hit: Farmers? Professionals? Semi-skilled? Businessmen?

where he is aggregated: City? Town? Suburb? Rural?

In what sense is it inequitable for him?

15. [* If Q. 13 is NO] Do you believe a uniform state-wide property tax would help cure any of the inequities?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

That finishes our questions concerning taxation at the local level in your state.

* Hand Card #3 to the respondent.

Now I would like to consider some federal alternatives. On Card #3 are the kinds of federal assistance to education.

INFORMATION FOR THE INTERVIEWER

CARD #3 DEFINITIONS

Special Revenue Sharing for Education:

A legislative proposal of President Nixon, currently pending before the Congress, that would consolidate over 80 existing categorical programs of federal aid to education into 5 classes. The funds would be distributed to states according to formula, without matching requirements or detailed application procedures. The states would have limited authority to transfer funds between the 5 classes.

Categorical Programs:

Federal grants to states and/or localities for support in specific areas of national concern, often narrowly defined in terms of program scope, target populations, and qualifications for receiving grants, and generally requiring detailed application procedures.

General Aid to Education:

Federal grants to the states for the support of education, without further specification as to use.

ITEM 17 DEFINITIONS

General Revenue Sharing:

The distribution of federal funds to states according to formula, for state and local use, without federal restrictions on their use.

Federal Financing of Welfare:

A federal takeover of welfare payments currently operated by the states. State funds for welfare may thereby be redistributed by the state into non-welfare budgets.

16. If your state were to receive a predetermined amount of money from the federal government and if you could elect which program the educational money was to come from, which program would you select?

*** Only one program is allowed.

If that program could not be used, what would be your second choice?

CARD #3

Type of Federal Assistance	Order of Preference (1= most preferred)
Special Revenue Sharing for Education	( )
Categorical Programs of national concern and emphasis	( )
General aid to Education	( )

17.1 General Revenue Sharing is a federal legislative proposal currently being discussed as potentially favorably affecting state finance. In this program federal funds would be distributed to states according to formula, for state and local use, without federal restrictions on their use.

Would you tend to favor or oppose such a program?

Favor ( )
Oppose ( )
No Opinion ( )

17.2 Another federal proposal being discussed concerns a Federal Financing of Welfare. In this program the state's responsibility for welfare activities would be taken over by the federal government. This should have the effect of releasing state funds now used in welfare for redistribution by the state into other activities.

Would you tend to favor or oppose such a program?

Favor ( )
Oppose ( )
No Opinion ( )

18.1 If your state were to receive new revenues from a General Revenue Sharing program, what proportion of these new funds would likely be used for additional educational expenditures? Would you say, "almost all of them," or "about half of them," or"very little of them," or "none of them?"

Almost all ( )
About half ( )
Very little ( )
None ( )
DK ( )

Same as from state( )

18.2 If state funds were released as a result of Federal Financing of Welfare, what proportion of the newly available money would likely be used for additional educational expenditures? Would you say "almost all of it," or "about half of it," or "very little of it," or "none of it?"

Almost all ( )
About half ( )
Very little ( )
None ( )
DK

Same as from state( )

19.1 How strongly do you favor or disfavor the substantially full state financing of education which exists in your state?

[*Substantially full = 75%-100%]

Strongly favor ( )
Mildly favor ( )
No Opinion ( )
Mildly disfavor ( )
Strongly disfavor ( )

19.2 How strongly would you favor or disfavor the idea of substantially full...that is, 75 to 100%...state financing of education in your state?

Strongly favor ( )
Mildly favor ( )
No Opinion ( )
Mildly disfavor ( )
Strongly disfavor ( )

20.1 Do you think that substantially full state financing of education has improved the equalization of any of the following factors in your state? Has it improved the equalization of...

	Yes	No	DK
...Tax effort?	☐	☐	☐
...Educational opportunity?	☐	☐	☐
...Expenditures per pupil?	☐	☐	☐
...Availability of special programs?	☐	☐	☐

20.2 Do you think that substantially full state financing of education would improve the equalization of any of the following factors in your state? Would it improve the equalization of...

	Yes	No	DK
...Tax effort?	☐	☐	☐
...Educational opportunity?	☐	☐	☐
...Expenditures per pupil?	☐	☐	☐
...Availability of special programs?	☐	☐	☐

21. How difficult do you believe it would be to obtain substantially full state financing in your state?

It already exists	☐
Very difficult	☐
Relatively difficult	☐
No Opinion	☐
Relatively easy	☐
Very easy	☐

22. Regardless of where the funds come from, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

Decisions relating to [* use list below]________ must be retained at the local level.

*List	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	No Opinion	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Teacher qualifications	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hiring and firing of teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pupil-to-teacher ratios	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Salary schedules	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

*** Give Card #4 to the Respondent

Various states have various target areas and focus their state school aid toward one or more factors.

23. On which of the factors on Card #4 is your state focusing its state school aid plans?

*** RECORD on Card #4 below.

CARD #4

Focus of State School Aid	Present Focus	Should be Increased	Should be Decreased	No Change
On school district enrollments or attendance	( )	( )	( )	( )
On differences in costs of educating pupils:				
from low income families	( )	( )	( )	( )
with low achievement scores	( )	( )	( )	( )
from minority groups	( )	( )	( )	( )
On all pupils, private and/or public	( )	( )	( )	( )

24. If you have any dissatisfaction with the present focus, which of these factors should be increased and which should be decreased?

*** Record on Card #4 above.

25. In your opinion does distribution of your state's school aid favor...

...Urban districts ( )
...Suburban districts ( )
...Rural Districts ( )
Don't Know ( )

Now let me return briefly to the question of state financing of education.

***Give Card #5 to Respondent

26. It is possible that local control and initiative would be interfered with or inhibited by substantially full state funding of education. For which of the items listed on Card #5 would this be true in your state?

*** Record the first column of answers

It is also possible that substantially full state funding of education would, in the long run, provide for a high quality of education. Again, referring to the items on Card #5, for your state, which of them would be aided by state funding of education?

*** Record second column of answers

CARD #5

	Inhibited	Aided
1. Teacher qualifications	( )	( )
2. Hiring and firing of teachers	( )	( )
3. Pupil-teacher ratios	( )	( )
4. Salary schedules	( )	( )
5. Curriculum	( )	( )
6. Selection of principals	( )	( )
7. Selection of superintendents	( )	( )

27. The fiscal powers of local school districts vary within different states. Will you please tell me approximately how many of the school boards in your state:

(a) independently levy taxes? Would you say "almost all" of them, "some" of them, or"none" of them independently levy taxes?

*** RECORD below and then ask (b)

(b) about how many depend on a unit of general government for levy?

*** Repeat headings: RECORD below. Do the same for (c)

(c) and how many depend on a special levy authority?

	Number of Local School Boards			
Method of Levy	Almost All	Some	None	DK
Independently levy taxes	☐	☐	☐	☐
Depend on a unit of general government for levy	☐	☐	☐	☐
Depend on a special levy authority	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other(specify)____________________________				

*** If Q 27 positive on"independently levy taxes", ask 28.

28. Approximately how many school districts have state-imposed rate limits on the local school tax?

Almost all ☐
Some ☐
None ☐
DK ☐

Approximately how many school districts have state imposed limits on the percent of increase in rates on the local school tax?

Almost all ☐
Some ☐
None ☐
DK ☐

Approximately how many school districts have state imposed automatic referenda on the local school tax?

Almost all ☐
Some ☐
None ☐
DK ☐

Approximately how many school districts have state imposed referendum by petition on the local school tax?

Almost all	( )
Some	( )
None	( )
DK	( )

29. What are your personal feelings about the financial structures of school boards? How strongly do you agree or disagree that school boards should be...

	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	No Opinion	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Financially independent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Dependent on a local unit of general government	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Financed by the state	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Elected rather than appointed	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other:______________________ ________________________	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

30. In many states, teacher's salaries and working conditions are established by professional negotiations or collective bargaining between teachers and local school boards, and the practice seems to be growing. It has been suggested that teacher's salaries be established on the state level.

	Yes	No	DK
(a) Would this be desirable in your state?	( )	( )	( )
(b) Would it be difficult to establish teachers' salaries at the state level?	( )	( )	( )
(c) Would it ease the financial burden of education on the local districts?	( )	( )	( )
(d) Would equally qualified and experienced teachers receive equal salaries regardless of where they teach?	( )	( )	( )

31. [*If NO to Q. 30 (d)] Your negative answer suggests that your state would need differentials in teacher's salary schedules in order to recognize differences in the various districts in your state. What are the important differences that would have to be recognized in your state?

*Cost of living ( )
*Living conditions ( )
*Differences in willingness of local districts to pay ( )
*Working conditions ( )
*Districts with teacher shortages ( )
Other:__________________( )

33. In the main, do you tend to be favorably or unfavorably disposed towards teacher tenure?

Favorable ( )
Unfavorable ( )

34. If negotiations are used to establish salaries and working conditions, should they also include the issue of teacher tenure?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

35. To what extent do you agree or disagree that local control in your state is...

...educationally desirable?
Strongly agree ( )
Mildly agree ( )
No Opinion ( )
Mildly Disagree ( )
Strongly Disagree ( )

...politically necessary?
Strongly agree ( )
Mildly agree ( )
No Opinion ( )
Mildly Disagree ( )
Strongly Disagree ( )

*
*Hand CARD #6 to Respondent
*

36. This card shows the percentages of educational funds for your state which come from federal, state, and local sources, as published by the Office of Education for 1969-70. If you had your way, what would you rather have the percentages be?

CARD # 6

Source	% Share	Would Prefer
Local	_____	_____
State	_____	_____
Federal	_____	_____
TOTALS	100%	100%

37. How much do you agree or disagree that both local and state boards of education should reflect the ethnic and socio-economic populations in your state?

Strongly agree ( )
Mildly agree ( )
No opinion ( )
Mildly Disagree ( )
Strongly Disagree ( )

38. Districts within the states vary by size. Some find the districting in the state too large or too small for different reasons.

Do you feel that your state contains some districts that are so large that administration of school districts is difficult or impossible?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

[*If YES] Which of the following do you feel is the best way to improve the situation?

Reorganize into smaller districts ( )

Decentralize within current legal districts ( )

Other:______________________________ ( )

39. Do you feel that your state contains some districts that are too small to operate effectively?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

*
* If YES, hand CARD # 7 to Respondent. Then ask
*

Which of the following do you feel would be the best way to improve the situation?

CARD #7

Reorganize into larger districts ( )
Heavy state finance ( )
Multi-district support services ( )
State-provided support services ( )

Other:______________________________ ( )

40. Who do you feel is the most influential individual with regard to change in [*Name of state] ________________ school programs right now?

Name: ________________________________

Position: ____

41. What group do you feel is the most influential with regard to change in [*Name of state] ______________ school programs right now?

Group Name: ___________________________________

Group position or function: ____________________

____

[*Probe for Respondent's understanding
[of Performance Contracting: Have
[you worked with Performance Contracting?
[Have you had much exposure to Performance
[Contracting? What kind of luck has your
[state had with Performance Contracting?

Very knowledgeable ( )
Somewhat.......... ( )
Little............ ( )
None.............. ( )

42. In your opinion, what effect do you believe the use of performance contracting would have on student achievement?

Increases it ( )
Decreases it ( )
No effect ( )
DK ( )

In your opinion, what effect do you believe the use of performance contracting would have on per-pupil costs?

Increases costs ( )
Decreases costs ( )
No effect ( )
DK ( )

In your opinion, do you think performance contracting provides a basis for accountability?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

43. Educational voucher plans are plans by which parents are given public funds to spend on their children's education in schools of their choice.

In your opinion, what effect do you believe education vouchers would have on...

...educational innovation?
Beneficial ( )
Harmful ( )
None ( )
DK ( )

...per-student costs?
Increase costs ( )
Decrease costs ( )
No effect ( )
DK ( )

...non-public schools?
Beneficial ( )
Harmful ( )
None ( )
DK ( )

...public schools?
Beneficial ( )
Harmful ( )
None ( )
DK ( )

...racial and ethnic separation in the schools?
Increase it ( )
Decrease it ( )
No effect ( )
DK ( )

44. How strongly do you agree or disagree that teachers from an ethnic minority are more effective in teaching that particular minority's pupils than are teachers from the majority group?

Strongly agree ( )
Mildly agree ( )
No opinion ( )
Mildly disagree ( )
Strongly disagree ( )

Reserve judgement ( )

Now I would like to ask you a few questions about school programs for disadvantaged pupils.

By a disadvantaged pupil I mean one who is educationally deprived or who has a low learning achievement. This may have arisen from a low-income family background, an ethnic minority, or from the use of a primary language other than English. By a disadvantaged pupil, I do not mean one who is either mentally retarded or physically handicapped.

45. Do you feel that adequate school programs for the disadvantaged pupil requires...

	Yes	No	DK
...higher expenditures per pupil?	( )	( )	( )
46. ...special teaching techniques?	( )	( )	( )
47. ...both disadvantaged and other pupils in the same classroom?	( )	( )	( )

*Qualifiers?______________________________

48. Apart from the things we have just mentioned, what do you think the requirements are for an adequate program for disadvantaged pupils?

____

____

____

49. Do you think that programs for the disadvantaged are inhibited in your state by...

	Yes	No	DK
...a lack of funds?	( )	( )	( )
...a shortage of qualified personnel?	( )	( )	( )
...unfavorable political or social climates?	( )	( )	( )

50. In your opinion, is it the fundamental problem that we do not know how to teach the disadvantaged?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

51. Considering these factors:
financial limitations,
lack of qualified personnel,
social or political climate, and
the state of the art in teaching,
do any particular programs come to your mind as being especially affected by these things?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

[*If YES] Which programs do you feel were affected?

____

____

52. In your opinion would pupil achievement and educational effectiveness be increased by lowering the age for formal, tax-supported education?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

[*If YES] To what age do you feel it should be lowered?

Lower to _____ years.

53. Most states require their pupils to attend school until they reach a certain age or a certain grade.

What is the nature of compulsory attendance in your state?

____ Age:_____

____ Grade:_____

____

Many students who are compelled to attend school are dissatisfied with compulsory attendance. Suppose your state were to develop a plan for changing or abolishing compulsory attendance.

*
*Hand CARD # 8 to Respondent
*
On this card is a list of program options which might be considered. Please take a couple of minutes now to read them over.

*
* Wait until Respondent has finished, then say
*

Assuming that the decision is yours, I would like you to go back through the list and select one option from each part--one from Part A, one from Part B, and so on.

Comments: ___________________________________ Part A _______

____ Part B _______

____ Part C _______

____ Part D _______

*If necessary, probe for the number of the options.
*

How difficult or easy would you make it for a student to come back to high school if he had withdrawn prior to graduation?

Very difficult ( )
Mildly difficult ( )
No opinion ( )
Mildly easy ( )
Very easy ( )

In your program, who would be the responsible authority for allowing a pupil to withdraw from school prior to graduation?

* the pupil ( )
* a teacher ( )
* a group of teachers ( )
* the principal ( )
* the superintendant ( )
* the school board ( )
* a state agency ( )
* the parents ( )
*

Other: ______________________________ ( )

What should be done with the students who drop out under your program prior to graduation? What is a reasonable approach?

No good approach ( )

____

____

54. Compared to other "industries," would you say that education spends more, about the same, or less of its resources in research and development?

More ( )
About the same ( )
Less ( )
DK ( )

55. Should educational research and development be increased in your state?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

[*If YES] How difficult do you think it would be to increase the support of educational research and development in your state?

Difficult ( )
Easy ( )
DK ( )

56. How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"A school-aged child is entitled to state support of his education, regardless of the school he attends."

Strongly agree ☐
Mildly agree ☐
No opinion ☐
Mildly disagree ☐
Strongly disagree ☐

57. How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Parents who wish to provide a private (non-public) school education for their children should not expect the taxpayers to contribute."

Strongly agree ☐
Mildly agree ☐
No opinion ☐
Mildly disagree ☐
Strongly disagree ☐

58. How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Whether or not non-public schools should receive public funds should be determined locally."

Strongly agree ☐
Mildly agree ☐
No opinion ☐
Mildly disagree ☐
Strongly disagree ☐

59. How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Open enrollment should be a condition for public support of non-public schools."

Strongly agree ☐
Mildly agree ☐
No opinion ☐
Mildly disagree ☐
Strongly disagree ☐

60. How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"If the non-public schools close down because of financial difficulties the burden upon the taxpayers will be greater since the public schools will have to absorb these children. Therefore, it is better to provide funds directly to non-public schools."

Strongly agree ☐
Mildly agree ☐
No opinion ☐
Mildly disagree ☐
Strongly disagree ☐

61. How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement:

"Rather than provide funds for non-public schools the states should be ready to assist any public school faced with sharply increased enrollments resulting from non-public school closings."

Strongly agree ☐
Mildly agree ☐
No opinion ☐
Mildly disagree ☐
Strongly disagree ☐

62. Rapidly rising costs of education, bearing heavily upon the taxpayers, have created a demand to know where the education tax dollar goes and what it buys; a term has become associated with this demand--accountability--which has several current interpretations.

What does accountability mean to you?

Businesslike management practices ( )
Good student achievement ( )
Adequate learning opportunities ( )
Faculty sets good example for students ( )
Well educated and experienced faculty ( )
Active principal and superintendent ( )
Good student behavior ( )
Other:

A.____________________________________ ( )

B.____________________________________ ( )

[*Probe for what Respondent feels to be the (not more than)
[two most important aspects of accountability.

63. Do you believe that pupil achievement tests are adequate measures of learning in reading and mathematics?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

Do you believe that pupil achievement tests are adequate measures of learning in the other subjects?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

64. [*If YES to either part of previous Q. 63]

Do you believe that proper management of educational programs requires pupil achievement testing?

Yes ( ) No ( ) DK ( )

[*If YES] In your opinion, should such tests be administered on a state-wide basis, or on a school-district basis?

Statewide basis ( )
School-district basis( )

65. When pupil achievement tests are used, do you believe the test results in your state should be compared against...

	Yes	No	DK
...Nationwide performance results?	( )	( )	( )
...Statewide performance results?	( )	( )	( )
...Local performance results?	( )	( )	( )
...Performance results for the applicable socioeconomic group?	( )	( )	( )

	Yes	No	DK
Would it be preferable to have the test results in your state compared against a defined body of knowledge and skills rather than against test performance results?	( )	( )	( )

66. In your state, what ways can you think of to improve the efficiency of education? That is, to provide equal or better education for the same or less money?

Probe GENTLY for 4 responses. None ( )

____

____

____

____

Thank the respondent and close the interview.

CARD # 1: REVENUES AT STATE LEVEL

					Inc.	Dec.	Same
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1. Personal Income	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Personal Property	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Real Property (or transfer of same)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Sales(general)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Motor Vehicle, Fuel and Road Taxes	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Excise Taxes (cigarettes, alcohol)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Business Taxes	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Racing(gambling, lottery, etc.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. Severance(timbering, mining)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Value - added	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. Inheritance and Gift	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. Other(please specify) ____________	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. Other(please specify) ____________	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

CARD #2

LOCAL SOURCES OF REVENUE

INCOME

PERSONAL INCOME

BUSINESS/INDUSTRY INCOME

SALES

PROPERTY

RESIDENTIAL NON-FARM

BUSINESS PROPERTY

FARM PROPERTY

ANY OTHER SOURCES? (PLEASE SPECIFY)

____

CARD #3

TYPE OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Special Revenue Sharing for Education

A legislative proposal of President Nixon, currently pending before the Congress, that would consolidate over 80 existing categorical programs of federal aid to education into 5 classes. The funds would be distributed to states, according to formula, without matching requirements or detailed application procedures. The states would have limited authroity to transfer funds between the 5 classes.

Categorical Programs of National Concern and Emphasis

Federal grants to states and/or localities for support in specific areas of national concern, often narrowly defined in terms of program scope, target populations, and qualifications for receiving grants, and generally requiring detailed application procedures.

General Aid to Education

Federal grants to the states for the support of education, without further specification as to use.

CARD #4

Focus of State Aid

ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENTS OR ATTENDANCE

ON DIFFERENCES IN COSTS OF EDUCATING PUPILS:
- FROM LOW INCOME FALIMIES
- WITH LOW ACHIEVEMENT SCORES
- FROM MINORITY GROUPS

ON ALL PUPILS, PRIVATE AND/OR PUBLIC

CARD #5

1. Teacher qualifications
2. Hiring and firing of teachers
3. Pupil-teacher ratios
4. Salary schedules
5. Curriculum
6. Selection of principals
7. Selection of superintendents

CARD #6

SOURCE		% SHARE	WOULD PREFER
LOCAL		______	______
STATE		______	______
FEDERAL		______	______
	TOTALS	100%	100%

CARD #7

REORGANIZE INTO LARGER DISTRICTS

HEAVY STATE FINANCE

MULTI-DISTRICT SUPPORT SERVICES

STATE-PROVIDED SUPPORT SERVICES

OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)

CARD # 8

PART A: AGE AND GRADE ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS
Please select one.

1. Do not change current age or grade requirements.
2. Reduce age and/or grade requirements.
3. Eliminate age and/or grade requirements.

PART B: CHANGES IN EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS
Please select one.

1. Do not change current educational offerings.
2. Provide large numbers of pragmatic courses in high school.
3. Provide special skills training centers apart from high school.

PART C: CHANGES IN TIME REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION
Please select one.

1. Do not change current time requirements for graduation.
2. Permit students to graduate early by accelerating their coursework.*
3. Permit students to graduate later by allowing them to elect one year off before completing high school (Sabbatical system).

PART D: CONDITIONS FOR WITHDRAWING FROM SCHOOL PRIOR TO GRADUATION
Please select one.

1. Students may withdraw at their request.
2. Students may withdraw when a judgment is made that they will not benefit from additional schooling.
3. Students may withdraw upon special authorization.

---

*For example, by attending school 12-months of the year as in a 4-quarter system, or by applying college credits to high school requirements, or by getting credit for courses through special "challenge" examinations, etc.

INSERT IN CARD #6 & ON PAGE 13

Table 68.—Estimated revenue and nonrevenue receipts of public elementary and secondary schools, by source and State: 1969-70

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

FEDERAL STATE LOCAL

State	Total revenue and nonrevenue receipts	Revenue receipts							Nonrevenue receipts
			Federal[1]		State		Local and other[2]		
		Total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
United States	$42,057,457	$38,475,921	$2,544,563	6.6	$15,645,366	40.7	$20,2[illegible]992	52.7	$3,581,536
Alabama[3]	418,861	408,861	59,144	14.5	257,717	63.0	92,000	22.5	10,000
Alaska	116,605	88,112	22,659	25.7	38,489	43.7	26,964	30.6	28,493
Arizona	375,966	347,283	30,226	8.7	165,127	47.5	151,930	43.7	28,683
Arkansas	272,247	247,247	42,164	17.1	112,384	45.5	92,699	37.5	25,000
California[4]	4,830,000	4,430,000	230,000	5.2	1,550,000	35.0	2,650,000	59.8	400,000
Colorado	438,700	418,700	26,900	6.4	106,000	25.3	285,800	68.3	20,000
Connecticut	685,200	635,200	23,700	3.7	210,000	33.1	401,500	63.2	50,000
Delaware	152,005	124,505	9,405	7.6	87,900	70.6	27,200	21.8	27,500
District of Columbia[4,5]	206,000	206,000	62,300	30.2	....	....	143,700	69.8	....
Florida	1,088,672	1,077,347	98,435	9.1	608,727	56.5	370,185	34.4	11,325
Georgia	692,789	642,789	68,157	10.6	377,566	58.7	197,066	30.7	50,000
Hawaii	171,200	171,200	15,500	9.1	149,000	87.0	6,700	3.9	0
Idaho[4]	127,100	118,100	9,100	7.7	51,000	43.2	58,000	49.1	9,000
Illinois	2,552,913	2,315,718	116,852	5.0	797,649	34.4	1,401,217	60.5	237,195
Indiana	1,150,700	1,030,100	41,800	4.1	360,000	34.9	628,300	61.0	120,600
Iowa[6]	604,258	554,258	22,100	4.0	167,000	30.1	365,158	65.9	50,000
Kansas	516,743	449,811	32,057	7.1	117,404	26.1	300,350	66.8	66,932
Kentucky	496,700	446,700	61,700	13.8	235,000	52.6	150,000	33.6	50,000
Louisiana	649,570	569,570	61,680	10.8	331,890	58.3	176,000	30.9	80,000
Maine[7]	195,000	175,000	9,400	5.4	78,500	44.9	87,100	49.8	20,000
Maryland	965,872	855,781	54,698	6.4	300,901	35.2	500,182	58.4	110,091
Massachusetts	1,086,700	998,400	60,000	6.0	200,000	20.0	733,400	74.0	88,300
Michigan	1,947,708	1,707,708	67,000	3.9	770,000	45.1	870,708	51.0	240,000
Minnesota	961,000	841,000	45,000	5.4	365,000	43.4	431,000	51.2	120,000
Mississippi	324,000	314,000	69,000	22.0	162,000	51.6	83,000	26.4	10,000
Missouri	798,323	741,323	46,351	6.3	255,972	34.5	439,000	59.2	57,000
Montana[4]	157,500	145,500	8,500	5.8	45,000	30.9	92,000	63.2	12,000
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nevada	109,300	10[illegible],300	6,200	6.0	40,500	39.2	56,600	54.8	5,000
New Hampshire[8]	125,939	11[illegible]138	4,670	4.2	9,400	8.5	96,068	87.2	15,800
New Jersey	1,623,000	1,503,000	64,000	4.3	429,000	28.5	1,010,000	67.2	120,000
New Mexico	211,708	204,344	28,659	14.0	128,174	62.7	47,511	23.3	7,364
New York	5,035,000	4,560,000	160,000	3.5	2,071,000	45.4	2,329,000	51.1	475,000
North Carolina	843,705	805,705	87,146	10.8	571,559	70.9	147,000	18.2	38,000
North Dakota	110,900	104,900	7,400	7.1	28,500	27.2	69,000	65.8	6,000
Ohio	2,013,100	1,773,100	83,000	4.7	560,000	31.6	1,130,100	63.7	240,000
Oklahoma	361,934	349,934	35,000	10.0	142,934	40.8	172,000	49.2	12,000
Oregon	512,500	470,500	27,500	5.8	97,000	20.6	346,000	73.5	42,000
Pennsylvania	2,315,268	2,214,268	127,621	5.8	1,039,369	46.9	1,047,268	47.3	101,000
Rhode Island	168,674	148,674	11,969	8.1	51,259	34.5	85,446	57.5	20,000
South Carolina	416,274	397,774	52,774	13.3	245,000	61.6	100,000	25.1	18,500
South Dakota	116,500	106,500	12,000	11.3	14,500	13.6	80,000	75.1	10,000
Tennessee	566,400	521,400	54,000	10.4	257,000	49.3	210,400	40.4	45,000
Texas[9]	2,022,200	1,812,200	166,500	9.2	775,000	42.8	870,700	43.0	210,000
Utah	225,546	217,123	12,050	5.5	111,615	51.4	93,458	43.0	8,423
Vermont	81,895	73,665	2,432	3.3	21,040	28.6	50,193	68.1	8,230
Virginia	895,000	820,000	75,000	9.1	300,000	36.6	445,000	54.3	75,000
Washington	770,270	680,270	40,270	5.9	400,000	58.8	240,000	35.3	90,000
West Virginia	285,000	279,000	34,500	12.4	134,500	48.2	110,000	39.4	6,000
Wisconsin	963,135	875,285	28,284	3.2	256,932	29.4	590,069	67.4	87,850
Wyoming[10]	76,700	72,700	16,200	22.3	18,500	25.4	38,000	52.3	4,000

Includes Federal grant programs to State and local systems, including aid to federally impacted areas, school lunch and milk, National Defense Education Act, Manpower Development and Training Act, vocational education, Economic Opportunity Act, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, etc. ESEA revenues have generally been estimated on an anticipated cash expenditure basis at a level similar to outlays in the previous year.

Includes revenue receipts from local and intermediate sources, gifts, and tuition and fees from patrons.

State revenue receipts include social security and teacher retirement for all educational agencies and institutions.

Estimated by NEA Research Division.

Federal revenue receipts include Federal appropriations for capital outlay, civil defense, Capitol Page School, and other federally funded programs.

[6] Includes State appropriation for area vocational schools and junior colleges not the responsibility of local school districts.

[7] Includes special State appropriation of $21,500,000 to change fiscal year of school districts.

[8] Excludes State's share of teacher retirement and social security.

[9] Excludes revenues for kindergartens.

[10] Includes in Federal revenue $9,000,000 in oil royalties which are appropriated by the State legislature for schools and could thereby be considered State funds.

NOTE: Because of rounding, percents may not add to 100.0.

SOURCE: National Education Association, Research Division, Research Report 1969-R15, *Estimates of School Statistics, 1969-70.* (Copyright © 1969 by the National Education Association. All rights reserved.)

OPINION SURVEY OF STATE LEGISLATURE EDUCATION COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

APPENDIX D

LIST OF SPECIAL TABULATIONS

The computer program is to be exercised on each of several different subsets of the data file. Specifications of these subsets follow the keypunch code numbers of States given now:

1. Alabama
2. Alaska
3. Arizona
4. Arkansas
5. California
6. Colorado
7. Connecticut
8. Delaware
9. Florida
10. Georgia
11. Hawaii
12. Idaho
13. Illinois
14. Indiana
15. Iowa
16. Kansas
17. Kentucky
18. Louisiana
19. Maine
20. Maryland
21. Massachusetts
22. Michigan
23. Minnesota
24. Mississippi
25. Missouri
26. Montana
27. Nebraska
28. Nevada
29. New Hampshire
30. New Jersey
31. New Mexico
32. New York
33. North Carolina
34. North Dakota
35. Ohio
36. Oklahoma
37. Oregon
38. Pennsylvania
39. Rhode Island
40. South Carolina
41. South Dakota
42. Tennessee
43. Texas
44. Utah
45. Vermont
46. Virginia
47. Washington (State)
48. West Virginia
49. Wisconsin
50. Wyoming

Subset 1: All Senators

Subset 2: All non-Senators

Subset 3: All Education Committee Chairmen

Subset 4: All Chairmen of other Committees

Subset 5: All respondents representing urban areas

Subset 6: All respondents representing suburban areas

Subset 7: All respondents representing rural areas

Subset 8: All respondents having non-Educational Assignments

Subset 9: All respondents who indicate local property tax relief is needed

Subset 10: All respondents who do not indicate local property tax is needed (all records not included under Subset 9)

Subset 11: All respondents who are judged "very knowledgeable" about performance contracting

Subset 12: All respondents who are judged to have little or no knowledge of performance contracting

Subset 13: The 10 States having greatest level of State financing of education. These States are:

1. Alabama
8. Delaware
9. Florida
10. Georgia
11. Hawaii
17. Kentucky
18. Louisiana
31. New Mexico
40. South Carolina
47. Washington

Subset 14: The 10 States having lowest level of State financing of education. These States are:

6. Colorado
16. Kansas
21. Massachusetts
27. Nebraska
29. New Hampshire
30. New Jersey
34. North Dakota
37. Oregon
41. South Dakota
50. Wyoming

Subset 15: The 10 States having the greatest level of local financing of education. These States are:

6. Colorado
16. Kansas
21. Massachusetts
27. Nebraska
29. New Hampshire
30. New Jersey
37. Oregon
41. South Dakota
45. Vermont
49. Wisconsin

Subset 16: The 10 States having the lowest level of local financing of education. These States are:

1. Alabama
2. Alaska
8. Delaware
10. Georgia
11. Hawaii
18. Louisiana
24. Mississippi
31. New Mexico
33. North Carolina
40. South Carolina

Subset 17: The 15 States having less than 5% of enrollment in nonpublic schools. These States are:

1. Alabama
2. Alaska
4. Arkansas
10. Georgia
12. Idaho
24. Mississippi
28. Nevada
33. North Carolina
36. Oklahoma
40. South Carolina
42. Tennessee
43. Texas
44. Utah
48. West Virginia
50. Wyoming

Subset 18: The 15 States having 5%, but less than 10%, of enrollment in nonpublic schools. These States are:

3. Arizona
5. California
6. Colorado
9. Florida
14. Indiana
16. Kansas
17. Kentucky
19, Maine
26. Montana
31. New Mexico
34. North Dakota
37. Oregon
41. South Dakota
46. Virginia
47. Washington

Subset 19: The 11 States having 10%, but less than 15%, of enrollment in nonpublic schools. These States are:

8. Delaware
11. Hawaii
15. Iowa
18. Louisiana
20. Maryland
22. Michigan
23. Minnesota
25. Missouri
27. Nebraska
35. Ohio
45. Vermont

Subset 20: The 9 States having 15% or more of enrollment in nonpublic schools. These States are:

7. Connecticut
13. Illinois
21. Massachusetts
29. New Hampshire
30. New Jersey
32. New York
38. Pennsylvania
39. Rhode Island
49. Wisconsin

Subset 21: The 8 States having less than 50% of population living in incorporated areas of 2,500 or more people. These States are:

2. Alaska
24. Mississippi
33. North Carolina
34. North Dakota
40. South Carolina
41. South Dakota
45. Vermont
48. West Virginia

Subset 22: The 21 States having 50%, but less than 70%, of population living in incorporated areas of 2,500 or more people. These States are:

1. Alabama
4. Arkansas
10. Georgia
12. Idaho
14. Indiana
15. Iowa
16. Kansas
17. Kentucky
18. Louisiana
19. Maine
23. Minnesota
26. Montana
27. Nebraska
29. New Hampshire
31. New Mexico
36. Oklahoma
37. Oregon
42. Tennessee
46. Virginia
49. Wisconsin
50. Wyoming

Subset 23: The 21 States having 70% or more of population living in incorporated areas of 2,500 or more people. These States are:

3. Arizona
5. California
6. Colorado
7. Connecticut
8. Delaware
9. Florida
11. Hawaii
13. Illinois
20. Maryland
21. Massachusetts
22. Michigan
25. Missouri
28. Nevada
30. New Jersey
32. New York
35. Ohio
38. Pennsylvania
39. Rhode Island
43. Texas
44. Utah
47. Washington

Subset 24: The respondents who favor General Revenue Sharing

Subset 25: The respondents who oppose General Revenue Sharing

Subset 26: The respondents who favor Federal Financing of Welfare

Subset 27: The respondents who oppose Federal Financing of Welfare

Subset 28: The respondents who strongly favor substantially full-State financing of education

Subset 29: The respondents who strongly disfavor substantially full-State financing of education

Subset 30: The respondents who indicate some of their State's school boards independently levy taxes

Subset 31: The respondents who indicate teachers' salaries should be established at the State level

Subset 32: The respondents who are in favor of teacher tenure

Subset 33: The respondents who are opposed to teacher tenure

Subset 34: The respondents who feel some school districts are too large to be properly administered

Subset 35: The respondents who feel some districts are too small to operate effectively

Subset 36: The respondents who feel programs for the disadvantaged are inhibited in their States by a lack of funds

Subset 37: Respondents who would like to lower the age for tax-supported education

Subset 38: Respondents who would like to change current age/grade requirements for compulsory attendance

Subset 39: Respondents who would not like to change current age/grade requirements for compulsory attendance

Subset 40: Respondents who agree that a child is entitled to State support of education regardless of the school he attends

Subset 41: Respondents who are opposed to State support of education regardless of the school the child attends

Subset 42: Respondents who believe achievement tests in reading and mathematics are suitable

Subset 43: Respondents who believe achievement tests in other subjects are suitable

Subset 44: Respondents who believe achievement tests are necessary for management

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1972 O - 457-206